FIVE CAPTIOUS QUESTIONS,

Propounded by a Factor for the

PAPACY:

Answered by a

DIVINE of the Church of God in *ENGLAND*,

By { *Parallel Questions*, and *Positive Resolutions*.

To which is added,
An occasional Letter of the Lord Viscount *FALKLAND* to the same Gentleman, much to this present purpose.

Job 34. 3, 4.
The ear trieth words, as the palate tasteth meat. Let us choose to us judgment: Let us know among our selves what is good.

Luke 12. 57.
Our Blessed Lord Jesus Christ says; *Yea, why do ye not even of your selves judge what is right?*

LONDON,
Printed by *T. R.* for *Hen. Bromie*, at the *Gun* at the West end of St. *Pauls*, 1673.

A Premonition TO THE READER.

THe Title Page of a Book doth commonly hold forth a Bill of Fare (as I may ſo ſpeak) whereby Paſſengers, who are either hungry after ſound knowledge, or delight to feed on the thin and airy Diet of Wit, or are greedy of Novelty, are invited to the Stationers Ordinary. But a Preface to the Reader is often neceſſary to excite and prepare his mind for the kindly reception, and good digeſtion of the Treatiſe it ſelf. Give me leave therefore (Courteous Reader) to arreſt you, before you ſit down to your

enterteinment, with giving you an Account concerning the Queſtions here agitated; the Anſwerers Engagement; and the occaſion with the deſign of this Publication.

First, As for the Five Queſtions, they have been of late years thrown about in ſeveral Families, where Popiſh Huntſmen or Fowlers take the boldneſs to ſet their toyls or ſnares to catch ſouls; inſomuch as they make near as much noiſe and yield as much matter of diſcourſe in England, *as the Five Propoſitions in* Janſenius *did lately in* France. *We may by this ſee the truth of* * St. Paul's *obſervation, that falſe Teachers are cunning Cheaters, like to common Gameſters, who are skilfull in all the tricks of Dice, true and falſe, and have* τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης, *a methodical courſe of impoſture.* † *The old and ſubtil Serpent, who is the Father of lyes, and active ſower of tares in Gods huſbandry, is the grand maſter of this art of deceiving. The Papiſts are the moſt diligent ſtudents, and the moſt unlucky proficients in this School of darkneſs, whoſe principal ſtudy it is to obſcure the light, and to hinder the power of truth. And their method is the ſame, that the adverſaries of our Bleſſed Saviour uſed, who attempted often to inſnare him by inſidious Queſtions, vainly preſuming, that their ſhallow wit could baffle him, who (unknown to them) was the eternal Wiſdom of God, vailed under a cloud of a mean* † *illiterate Carpenter. But* * *our only Maſter, the Chriſt, quickly put them to ſilence and ſhame, either by propounding croſs queſtions, or by parables, wherein they might with little ſtudy read their own malice and folly. And as then, they that thus lay in wait to intangle Chriſt in his diſcourſe were the Emiſſaries of the High Prieſt and his Councel, who were in appearance the viſible Church of God, but did ſet themſelves in oppoſition againſt*

* Eph. 4. 14. ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐν πανουργίᾳ, πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης.

† Apoc. 12. 9. Joh. 8. 44.

Mat. 13. 38, 39.

† Mar. 6. 3. Joh. 7. 15.

* Mat. 23. 8.

See Mark 11. 27. & 12. 13.

againſt Chriſt and the Goſpel, and thoſe Antichriſtian Miniſters acted by inſtructions given forth by thoſe who ſet them on work: Thus the Popiſh Circumforanei, *that go up and down like the juggling Exorciſts at* Epheſus, *do not* Act. 19. 13. *act meerly by their ſingular private fancies, but as they are taught and preſcribed by their ſuperiors, and the well-head of their Sophiſtries is the Court of* Rome. *There are indeed in the ſeven-headed or ſeven-hilled City, which is the ſeat of the Mother of abominations, more ſhops then one, where theſe weapons are forged, The Congregation for the propagation of the* Tridentine *Faith, the Schools of the* Loyoliſts, *the Engliſh Seminary, without doubt are all deep in Counſel, and hard at work, now or never (for* England's *unhappy diviſions fomented ſecretly by Papiſts, are* Rome's *moſt advantageous opportunities) to reduce this laſt Nation to become once more enthralled and tributary to the* Pope's *ſpiritual uſurped Monarchy, which indeed is an Antichriſtian Kingdom of this World. Hence comes that conſent in the way, which* Romaniſts *now take to gain* Proſelytes. *But we may further obſerve, that by order they alter their courſe, and ſhift their weapons every forty years or thereabouts, ſince the Reformation, which indeed is no light argument of a weak Cauſe, which cannot ſtand without ſhifting the ground, and the defences of it. But ſtill they accommodate their perſenſions to the different temper and humour of our Countreymen, that are variable in ſeveral ages, taking advantage alſo from the changes in the ſtate of the Kingdom, in which the Church cannot but ſuffer ſome alteration in the outward form of Eccleſiaſtical Adminiſtrations. I can upon a good occaſion offred produce five Popiſh Propoſitions caſt abroad in A. D.* 1623. *and alſo the Anſwer of a learned and pious Divine then living,*

Septem urbs clara jugis, toti quæ præſidet orbi. Propert. Apoc. 17. 9 18.

and

and ſtill of happy memory. Thoſe were of a faſhion ſomewhat different from theſe Queſtions, but tended to the ſame purpoſe. For the chief aim of all ſuch writings is to amuſe Proteſtants, eſpecially thoſe who are unacquainted with true antiquity, and to put them off from applying the Rule of faith delivered in the holy Scriptures to the preſent Religion of Rome, *and from attending on that Miniſtry, which is Gods Ordinance for our inſtruction, and under which Gods providence hath ſeated us, and to make men gape after an infallible Guide, which Papiſts ſay is neceſſary, but for no other reaſon, but becauſe they hope (as they endeavour) to coſen credulous people to miſtake the Papacy for that infallible Guide. Theſe men are ſo blinded with ſelf-intereſt and pride, that they ſtrongly preſume, that theſe five Queſtions, as being the two-horned Arguments of the Beaſt, are ſo ſubtilly framed, that whether we anſwer Yea, or Nay, we are catched for certain, and ſhall be forced to deny our own principles, and to confeſs the exiſtence of an infallible Guide ſomewhere, though it be in ſome undiſcovered corner of the earth. And they have ſuch a mean opinion of us for ſhortneſs of ſight, and eaſineſs of belief, that being once drawn to the acknowledgement of an infallible Guide, we cannot chooſe but take the bare word of a few Italian Factors, that the moſt magnificent Whore of* Babylon *deſcribed by St.* John *to the life, and deſigned evidently to be the Papal Power of* Rome *as it appears at this day, is the infallible Guide of Gods Inſtitution. I ſhall add but one Advertiſement concerning the prepoſterouſneſs of this procedure. This Queſtioniſt in the cloſe of his Reply, ſays, that till his Queſtions are anſwered he hath nothing to do with the proof of any thing. It is a remarkable thing, that all Papiſts by the inſtruction com-*

mon

men to all their Schools of deceit, dispose their Disputants to decline proving any thing, and to impose that burden of proof upon their adversaries. But we that do take our selves to be in the just possession of the faith once delivered unto the Saints, and indeed do build our Religion upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, that is, upon the writings of both, (as Abraham *in his Dialogue with* Dives *gives the name of* Moses *and the* Prophets *to their holy Books left behind them) do reasonably expect, that whosoever goes about to draw us off from that Church and way of salvation, wherein we are engaged, unto another Society, under pretence, that we can be safe no where else but in that Ark, do strongly and clearly prove, that our Religion is for the main body of it false, treacherous, and destructive of salvation, and that the Society to which we are invited by Papists is the sole Mistress of saving truth. For all that are acquainted with the course, either of Judicial proceedings, or of Scholastical disputations, know well, that this Rule holds,* Actori, *and,* Asserenti incumbit probatio, *The proof lies upon the Accuser, or the Averrer of any thing. But this puzling way without proving of any thing, savours so strongly of deceit, and is so far from a fair way of reasoning, that it can catch none but them, that are unsetled in their Religion, and Novices in both divine and humane learning. And because there are too many such in the world, whose precious souls are in danger at this time, the discovery of Popish illusions is now become*

Eph. 2. 20.

Luk. 16. 29, 31. *They have Moses and the Prophets, let them hear these. If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be perswaded, if one arise from the dead.*

Where note, that the holy Scriptures bear in them the same Authority, that was in the living persons of

Moses and the *Prophets*, and also have the same efficacious vertue to beget faith, as their words had being orally pronounced, and where these lively Oracles are freely confuted, and faithfully applyed, (though by men that are short of Infallibility, but faithfull dispensers of holy mysteries) an infallible Guide is superfluous: Also mark, that where the Authority of Scriptures is despised, Miracles, (and there is the same reason to say so of Infallibility) are useless, because uneffectual to work faith.

anc-

a neceſſary work of the prudent and faithfull Guides of ſouls, who by Gods grace have an actual certainty of their Religion, and can juſtly ſay, in the words of St. John, We know, that we are of the truth, *and*, We know that God hath given us a mind or underſtanding to know the true God, and we are in him that is true, (1 *Joh.* 3. 19. and 5. 20.) *although they have not the vanity to challenge to themſelves an Infallibility. So much for the five Queſtions in general, which whether the Divine hath anſwered or no, it is now free for the inäifferent Reader to judge.*

As for this Anſwerers Engagement in the Controverſie, it was very caſual. A *Romaniſt that is very zealous to promote the* Pope's *Intereſt in this Kingdom, had endeavoured to gain credit with the* Eve *by a ſurpriſal, and if the old ſtratagem had proſpered, by her inſinuation to draw in the* Adam, *preſuming that the Rhetorick of love would be more prevalent, then his Logick upon a conſiderate Gentleman. To this end a Copy of the five Queſtions was commended to the perſons with a preſumption, that no Miniſter of our Church could give a fit and full Anſwer to theſe confounding Queries. And then it was to be hoped, that the parties aſſaulted would preſently deſpiſe, and then deſert a Church, that was unfurniſhed of a Miniſtry able to anſwer ſuch doughty Queſtions, as the refined Wits of Papiſts deviſe. It was alſo to be ſuppoſed, that whoſoever breaks off from our Church, would without any further ado at the next ſtep run into that which is next him, the* † Mat. 7. 13. *Noctes atque dies patet atri janua Ditis,* *Church of* Rome, *whoſe* † *wide gate ſtands open day and night, and is ready to receive all that would find a broad way to Heaven, ſuch as is the Roman paſſage by a Prieſts Abſolution without a holy life, or ſincere contrition for a debauched.*

bauched. But it fell out about this time, that * *a Countrey Minister of the Gentlemans ancient acquaintance being in the City, and invited to dine at his Lodging, came to see his Friend a little sooner, then some other Guests then expected. The Gentleman thought fit to make these Questions a part of the Ministers entertainment. The Minister took the short time of that expectation to read the Riddle, and after a small ruminating took Pen and Ink, and set down the double Answer hereafter following, and resigned the Writing to the Gentleman to be disposed of at his pleasure. Shortly after the Romish Mountebank renewed his visit, to see how the Pill had wrought. The Gentleman then took the opportunity to deliver him the Ministers Paper. But many moneths past, before any return was made: at length a Reply was communicated to the Gentleman, who conveyed it to the Answerer as soon as he could conveniently, being at a distance from him by the interposition of several Counties. The Minister took his first time of leisure to give his sence of this Reply, by a Letter to his Friend, who was the person concerned in the Contest, as being the man aimed at for to be made a Roman Convert, that is to say in plain terms, a child of Hell in a double measure, for leaving the clear and living Well of salvation, and then seeking it in a broken cistern, or in a foul puddle of errors and corruptions. Withall it was the Ministers intent, that the Letter should be imparted unto the Romanist, that he might make some good use of it: For the Protestants charity is imployed to turn a sinner from the error of his way, as well as to secure a Christian in the path of righteousness. And although this transaction was past A. D. 1666. yet he that drove the trade pursued it no further, and hath neither (as it was on our side*

* This Rustick Divine says of himself, Ἀγροικός εἰμι, τὴν σκάφην σκάφην λέγω. He speaks plainly, he calls things by their right names.

heartily

Non eſt pudor ad meliora tranſire. Ambroſ.

heartily deſired) acknowledged his error, whereof he might be convinced, and confeſs it, with a wholeſome ſhame; nor attempted any vindication of his Writing, that we know of, which ſilence hath more of prudence, then any freſh proffer of more impertinencies could have. His ſilence therefore cannot be taken for conſent in a matter of Religion, *where the confeſſion of our faith is a duty; but may be taken for a modeſt laying down of his weapons.*

Rom. 10. 10.

Now as for this way of publication of all that hath paſs'd on both ſides, he that obſerves the bold activity of Romaniſts at this time, may apprehend a ſufficient reaſon of it, without being told one. Indeed the Gentleman who had an intereſt in the Papers had uſed his freedom by ſhewing them to ſome Divines of our Church, who gave a favourable judgement of the Miniſters whole deſign, and adviſed the Gentleman to publiſh that, which they conceived to be of a general concernment, and might prove a publick benefit by the removal of a ſtumbling block laid in the way of weak Chriſtians, and might be uſefull to the prevention of much miſchief, which theſe Queſtions might produce, if permitted to paſs uncontrolled.

The Miniſter hereupon hath been preſt for his leave to let his Writings with the Adverſaries to paſs the Preſs. And he conſidered, that there was no reaſon imaginable, why he ſhould now conceal what was deſigned for the maintenance of our Religion from the ſight of his Brethren, which he had before expoſed to the view and cenſure of our Adverſaries, who are ſeldom equal Judges of our Writings. Since therefore the five Queſtions are ſpread abroad by our Adverſaries, who may have too great a complacency in their own inventions as unanſwerable, if we all paſs them by as contemptible, but may by Gods grace, which often

works

works by weak inſtruments, and beyond mans opinion, be moved and directed to conſider their ways, and turn their feet unto Gods teſtimonies, even for their ſakes, who both are miſerably miſled, and alſo induſtriouſly miſlead others, as well as for the good of our fellow-travellers whoſe company we deſire to keep in Gods wayes of truth and peace, the Miniſter hath complied with the Gentlemans deſires in this particular, and both have the Chriſtian civility to communicate the uſe of their Light to all travellers that may reap benefit by it, whether they be in or out of the way. But becauſe we publiſh the Writings of a Papiſt, we deſire to aſſure the Reader, that the Gentleman is not ſo void of Honour, which is his particular Conſcience, and the Miniſter is not ſo forgetfull of his Office, whereof Fidelity *is the quality, as that either of them ſhould by any wilfull alteration corrupt and falſifie them in the private conveyance, or in the preſent publiſhing. The Miniſter indeed in his ſecond pains of preparing all for the Preſs by tranſcription, hath upon the review of his own Letter to his Friend added two ſhort Conſiderations, which for diſtinctions ſake are incloſed within theſe marks [ ]. Alſo he hath made ſome ſmall alteration in a few ſentences for the fuller explication of his own Anſwers. This he thinks it neceſſary to advertiſe the Reader of, becauſe the Romaniſt who gave out the Queſtions and made the Reply, may have the curioſity to peruſe this Book, as being concerned in it. If then he ſhall compare my Letter as it now runs, with that which was formerly imparted to him, and find ſomething altered, and ſome things added, he hath yet no reaſon to cavil or carp at the Miniſters proceeding as unſincere, or to charge him with foul play in calling this the Letter to his Friend dated* June 18. 1666. *For he hath*

Pſa l. 119 59. — *Mos eſt miſeris, trahere omnia ſecum, Merſa juvat.* — Lucan.

* 1 Cor. 4. 2.

unsaid nothing, which was then delivered, and he hath only endeavoured both to make himself to be better understood then he might have been before, and also to instruct his Friend more fully concerning two particulars, which he had occasion to treat of. If therefore the Romanist list to read this second Edition of the Letter, he will have cause to thank the Minister for his double diligence to discover his errors, and to give him fuller satisfaction then formerly. And this comes timely enough to prevent his Defence, or to procure his Amendment. Thus (gentle Reader) thou maist perceive the whole design of the publication of this party-coloured Discourse.

I shall detain thee yet a little longer with offering unto thee a Consideration that is near a kin to our Matter in hand. We see the indefatigable diligence of Romanists equal to that of the Scribes and Pharisees, whom our Blessed Saviour branded with the infamous character of Hypocrites, and denounced a dreadfull Woe against them, for their restless travels, and driveliſh labours in compassing Sea and Land to make one Proselyte. I desire my Christian Reader to observe the Parallel between them. The Roman Sheep-stealers of this Age, the Scribes and Pharisees took upon them to be the Guides of Gods people in that Nation of the Jews which was the only visible Church of God at that day, and had obtained great credit with the vulgar by the ostentation of counterfeit holiness, boasting of knowledge, and pretence of Authority. The Jewish Church was then very corrupt in Religion, not indeed by Idolatry, as formerly before the Babylonian *Captivity, (for the smart of Gods rod lying long on their backs made them after their return for ever weary of Idols) but by a tenacious adherence to humane Traditions; which burden,*

Mat. 23. 15

how

how heavy and hard to be born, the Lawyers conſidered not, but the Scribes and Phariſees bound upon the conſciences of the people for religious Ordinances of divine original, not written in the Law of Moſes, *but traduced by oral tradition of the Fathers. It was then (as* David *ſpeaks) high time for the Lord to work, to lay to his hand, that is his Miniſtry, when they had deſtroyed Gods Law, and made his Commandements of none effect by the traditions of men. Yea, St.* Peter *ſays, that Chriſt died to redeem his people by his blood from that vain converſation, which the Jews were enſlaved unto by the tradition of their Fathers. The Phariſees then, that took ſuch pains to make Proſelytes, did not make it their buſineſs to gain ſtrangers to the Commonwealth of* Iſrael, *unto a communion with the people of the God of* Abraham *according to the pure Law of* Moſes, *for which Chriſt certainly would never have condemned them, as he did. But the aim of their labours was to increaſe their own party, by captivating men under their yoke of Authority to the obſervance of a traditional Religion, and thereby to ſtrengthen their power and worldly intereſt in that Nation, which was called by Gods Name. Now, for this inveagling of Diſciples to the keeping of counterfeit Traditions, ſome whereof were but vain and uneffectual to ſanctification, others were violations of Gods Law, our juſt Maſter curſes theſe ſeduced and ſeducing Guides for making their wretched followers the children of Hell, even worſe then themſelves, by engaging their new conquered Subjects to the moſt violent hatred, and fierce oppoſition of the truth, and the profeſſors of it. See now, how the Papiſts tread in the ſteps of the Phariſees, and in one particular out-act their crimes. Their pretence to the Chair of Authority indowed with Infallibility, their*

Pſal. 119. 126. Mat 15. 3. Mark 7. 9, 13.

1 Per. 1. 18, 19.

out-

outward varniſhes of ſanctity laid over their covetouſneſs and uncleanneſs, their horrid hypocriſies, I omit to ſpeak of. But their Proſelytizing is that which I propound to your notice. Their work is not to convert Pagans from the worſhip of Devils and dead Idols to ſerve the true and living God, nor to turn Jews and Turks, who abhor Idols, and therefore are too rationally ſcandalized by Roman Idolatries, and averted from Chriſtianity by that conſpicuous Mother of ſpiritual fornications, but to pervert Chriſtians, who know and worſhip the only true God through and with the One Mediator Jeſus Chriſt according to the ſimplicity of the Goſpel, and to perſwade theſe to break off communion with all other Chriſtians, who have obtained the 2 Pet. 1. 1. *like precious faith with themſelves, and to ſubject their ſouls to the conduct of Traditionaries, and ſo to become an acceſſion to a potent Sect or Faction in Chriſtendom. Indeed the Roman Sectaries are in no ſmall meaſure more pernicious falſe Teachers then the Phariſees, becauſe they not only evacuate the Authority of the Goſpel, and corrupt the purity of Chriſtian Religion, by novel devices, ſome directly repugnant to Law and Goſpel, others vainly ſuperſtitious, and all obtruded under the falſe title of Traditions; but alſo have introduced into their Religion the moſt groſs Idolatries, that ever the Devil did pollute the confe-* Apoc. 17. & 18. *derate ſervants of God withall. Since then the purple Whore hath made the Kings of the Earth and many Nations drunk with the poyſoned Wine of her fornications, as St.* John *being in the Spirit foreſaw and foretold, and it is the labour of Roman Emiſſaries to invite Engliſhmen to drink of her golden Cup, St.* John's *Caution was never more neceſſary for Chriſtians then now,* Little Children, 1 Joh. 5. 20. keep your ſelves warily from Idols: *And Chriſts Admonition*

monition concerns us nearly, Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees. *Since Papists are thus manifestly the heirs and successors of the Scribes and Pharisees, let all that love their own souls decline the snares of these travellers to make Proselytes, lest while they think to find a new way to Heaven, which is called Tradition, they be made the children of Hell. Here indeed we have set one* * *snare of the Devil before thine eyes, the Papists first set it to take Christians captive, and set it in secret, in chambers, whispering in the dark, but now what was spoken in the dark, and in the closet, is brought forth to be examined by the light, and I hope, that this stratagem of our enemies is defeated by being discovered. Indeed it is a happy ignorance not at all to know the depths of Satan; but since God hath in his wise and just providence let* loose Satan *amongst us, who can transform himself into an Angel of light, and transfigures his messengers into the Apostles of Christ, who spare no pains to vent his delusions, we had need to pray heartily, that God will be our Sun to enlighten us with the saving beams of his heavenly truth which shine in his written Word, and our shield, our shelter, our shadow to secure us from the snare of the Fowler, from the pestilence that walketh in darkness, and the destruction (the bold-faced Devil) that wasteth at noon-day. And that the Christian Reader may be provided of an Antidote against this noysom pestilence, and that he may both see and escape the deceit and destruction of this snare, is the end of this publication; which God make prosperous to his Glory.* Amen.

Mat. 16. 6.

* 2 Tim. 2. 26.

Read Luk. 12. 1, 2, 3.

Apoc. 2. 24. 2 Cor. 11. 13, 14.

Psal. 91. 1, 3, 6.

C. G.

First

First SECTION,

Containing the

PAPISTS QUERIES.

Five Queries propounded in Religion.

1. WHether there is not in all ages a visible Catholick Church? 1.

2. Whether out of the visible Catholick Church any can attain Salvation? 2.

3. Seeing there are now very many Professions amongst Christians, which give themselves out to be either the holy Catholick Church, or part of it; I desire to know by designation, which amongst them all is now the holy Catholick Church? 3.

4. Whether the Holy Catholick Church so designed can teach her Children any error, as matter of Christian Faith either destructive of Salvation, or endangering the attaining of it? 4.

5. If the said Catholick Church can teach errors, as matter of Christian Faith, how any Christian can be infallibly certain that She hath not taught some error in determining the Canon of Scripture, 5.

ture, and in teaching ſome Book, or Books, to be the word of God, which is not ſo; and then what certainty any one can have, that all thoſe Books are Gods word, which Gods Church delivers to be his word?

[A Categorical Anſwer to theſe Queries is demanded.]

Second Section containing the Divines Anſwer.

I. THe Queries anſwered by propounding others, reflecting upon the State of the Jewiſh Church of God, to which God had made as ample promiſes of its continuance, till *Shiloh* came in humility, as he made of the Chriſtian Churches perpetuity, till the ſame Saviour come in glory.

1. Whether according to the veracity of Gods promiſes, there were not then to be a Viſible Church of the Jewes?

2. Seeing the Kingdom and Church of the ten tribes pretended to the truth and ſervice of God, as well as the Houſe of David with the Prieſthood at Hieruſalem, and even that Kingdom and Prieſthood were ſometime infected with groſs Idolatry, and that publickly ſet up and erected; I deſire to know by what deſignation a Jew, that was truly inquiſitive of the way and means of Salvation, ſhould then diſcern and diſcover that Church, in which he might find it, and out of which, he could not, ſince (as Chriſt himſelf affirms *John* 4. 22.) Salvation was then of the Jews?

3. Whether the Viſible Society of the Jewiſh Nation that was in covenant with God could not teach her Children any error as matter of Religion, that was corruptive of the ſame, and deſtructive of Salvation?

4. If the ſaid Church could teach ſuch errors, how any Jew could be infallibly certain, that the living Oracles

cles committed to that people were not corrupted, or lying legends obſtructed under pretence of Holy Scripture.

5. If God in that Oeconomie did preſerve the Holy Scriptures, which were to be the ſtanding Rule of Religion, to which private perſons were to have recourſe for their direction, to ſecure themſelvés from the ſeducement of erring Guides (*Eſa.* 8. 20. and 9. 16. compared); and alſo the Inſtrument of publick Authority, for reformation of a corrupted Church: why may not the Scriptures of the New Teſtament, added to the Oracles of the Old, be ſufficient to make us wiſe unto Salvation, and to enable them who have their ſenſes exerciſed therein, to diſcern between good and evil?

[If the Queriſt can frame a good Anſwer that might ſatisfy the conſcience of a Jew, then, *mutatis mutandis*, the ſame will be an Anſwer to his own Queries.]

II. Take this Categorical Anſwer to the ſaid Queries.

1. There was, is, and ſhall be till the worlds end, a Catholick Church, that in every age is viſible by the profeſſion of Chriſtianity to the perſons then living.

2. Out of this Catholick Church ordinarily there is no Salvation.

3. That is the Holy Catholick Church, which profeſſeth that One Holy Catholick Faith, once for all delivered unto the Saints, whereof the Holy Scriptures are the Conſervative and Rule.

4. That Holy Catholick Church teaches no error deſtructive of Salvation.

5. Therefore cannot, ſo long as it continues ſo, abuſe the world by impoſing falſe, or forged Scriptures upon it.

Quere further;

What reaſon now from hence can be deduced, why any rational perſon ſhould deſert the Church of England, that adheres to (the acknowledged Rule of Faith) the Scrip-

tures, and enter into the preſent Church of Rome, which at the threſhold requires him to renounce his Senſes, Reaſon, and Charity, and obliges him to the belief of a Creed compoſed a few years ago at *Trent*, which we deſire the Papiſts to prove was the Catholick Faith of the truly antient and Catholick Church.

Third Section containing the Papiſts Reply.

N. 1: A Categorical Anſwer to the Queries concerning the Jewiſh Church.

I *Admit the promiſes of God here mentioned reſpectively to Jews and Chriſtians.*

A. to 1. Q. *To the firſt I anſwer affirmatively.*

A. to 2. Q. *The Second commits a fallacy of* Ignoratio elenchi. *The Queries about the Chriſtian Church (to which theſe ought to correſpond) proceed not upon any particular Kingdom, no nor upon any particular Church, nor on every one, or any particular number of the Prieſts or Paſtors of the Church; but upon the repreſentative Catholick Church in a full and lawful meeting of the chief Paſtors to teach the Church diffuſive, what ſhe is to believe as matter of Faith, or to reject as errors in Faith, when queſtions ariſe about any of them. I therefore anſwer, that when any ſuch queſtion aroſe amongſt the Jews, they were neither to have their laſt refuge to the Kings of Iſrael or Judah, nor to the State, Magiſtrates, or common people for reſolution in what they were to believe; but to the lawful High Prieſt for the time, with his High Council or Synod of other chief Prieſts and Doctors, in the Law of Moſes: And they were to conform their belief to what they defined, and taught them; ſo that whatſoever either the Kings, or ſome number of inferior Tribes, or ſome particular Prieſts, taught, practiſed, or believed, contrary to the Doctrine and definition of this Supreme Spiritual Council was to be held erroneous, and thoſe who held forth ſuch erroneous Doctrine pertinaciouſly, or practiſed*

practiſed publickly contrary to it, were to be eſteemed in their doctrine Hereticks, and in their practiſe Nonconformiſts to the True Church, or Separatiſts from it. If therefore a Jew in the times mentioned in the Querie ſhould have demanded, which was then the True Viſible Church, wherein Salvation could be acquired, the anſwer muſt have been, That it was the High Prieſt then being, and all theſe believers, who conformed their Faith, Practiſes and Communion to him and his high Council, ut ſupra: *And all ſuch, as ſtood in oppoſition againſt him, and diviſion from him, were Aliens (ſo long as they continued in that ſtate) from the True Church. Now if the Queriſt had proved efficaciouſly, that the High Prieſt with his fore named Council taught the people, either Idolatry, (the common ſin of the Jews) or any other breach of Gods Law, to be lawful, or any error againſt Gods Revelations to be true, or any of his Revelations to be falſe, he had overthrown the whole fabrick of my Queries. But ſeeing this is not yet done by him, his Queries are neither an Anſwer, nor any obſtruction to mine, and therefore they remain in their full vigour againſt him. For notwithſtanding all he ſays in his ſecond Query, (which is the main force of his inſtance) I have clearly ſhewed, a Jew of thoſe times, which was then the True Viſible Church, out of which Salvation could not be had. Now it is impoſſible, to prove any ſuch matter, unleſs he enervate the words of our Saviour,* Mat. 23.2,3. *where he ſays, That whatſoever the Scribes and Phariſees taught, who had and did ſit in* Moſes *his chair (that is ſucceeded in his Spiritual authority) was to be obſerved and done by all the Jewiſh people: which ſuppoſes evidently, they could not teach them either error in Faith and Manners, as part of Gods word; for then he ſhould have commanded to do evil, and believe errors: ſo that they were infallible in their teaching till* Shiloh *came. And the reaſon why they were ſo infallible (ſays our Saviour) was, becauſe they ſate upon* Moſes *his chair, and ſo governed ſucceſſively the Church of God faithfully in matter of doctrine, as he did in his time:* Upon the chair of Moſes have ſate the Scribes and Phariſees: All therefore that they ſhall ſay unto you, Obſerve and do it. *And this reaſon proves not only, thoſe that ſate then when our Saviour ſpake*

theſe

these words, but that all those who ſate before them ever ſince the time of Moſes *were infallible in all divine doctrines both of Faith and Manners.*

A. to Q. 3. *The third Querie is therefore thus anſwered; That the Jewiſh Church, (underſtood* ut ſupra*) could not teach any error, as matter of Divine Faith or Religion.*

A. to Q. 4. *To the fourth Querie, I anſwer, That, though from the precedent Anſwers, it followes, that the Jewiſh Church by divine direction preſerved the Holy Scriptures ſo entirely, that it never rejected any true part of Gods written word, nor received into their Canon of Gods written word any Book, or Sentence, which was not his word; yet it followes not thence, that every private perſon ſhould find out every particular point of Religion by particular or expreſs proofs out of that written word alone; but that the Authority of the Jewiſh Church,* ut ſupra*, in matters controverted, ſhould interpoſe it ſelf, and determine the controverſie. Nor do the two Texts quoted in the Querie prove thus much: For that* Eſa. 8. 20. *proves only this, that they were neither to have recourſe to Soothſayers, nor to extraordinary viſions, but to the Law and Teſtament, when doubts aroſe. Now this is ſo far from forbidding to have recourſe to the preſent reſpective Prieſts and Governors of the Church, that the Law and Teſtament command expreſly, that recourſe is to be had to them in doubtful caſes,* Deut. 17. *from the* 8th. *to the* 12th. *verſe, and* Malachi. 2. *from the* 4th. *to the* 8th. *In which places the interpretation of the Law is reſerved to the Prieſt, and the diſobedience to the Prieſts command, declared to be ſo great a ſin, that it is to be puniſhed with no leſs than death. And for the Scriptures themſelves, it was ſo far from the Ordinance of* Moſes *his Law, that every particular or private Believer had licenſe, or opportunity, or ordinary poſſibility to peruſe them, and gather from them by his ſole peruſal, what was, and what was not to be believed, (as private Proteſtants now do) that the Law was only to be read to them once in Seven years,* Deut. 31. 10, 11. *and was accordingly performed by* Eſdras, Nehem. 8. 1, 2, 3. *And this was all we read in Scripture of the common People knowing the written word. And it appears, that the people were*

ſo

ſo far from undertaking by their own private judgements to attain to the full meaning of every hard ſentence in the Law, that it is ſaid v. 79. *that the* Levites *interpreted to the people, and that* Eſdras *taught them: And* v. 13. *not only the people, but the inferior Levites and Prieſts came to* Eſdras *the chief Prieſt to hear from him the interpretation of the Law. Now the reſpondent, if he will make a parallel between the common people of the Jews and his Proteſtants, muſt produce ſome clear place of Scripture, where the Books of the Law of* Moſes, *and not only they, but the whole Old Teſtament was as common and familiar in the houſes and hands of every ignorant Jew, as the Old and New Teſtament is now in the houſes and hands of every ignorant Proteſtant, which I believe he will find a very hard task, ſeeing Printing being then unknown to the world, it would have been very difficult to have found ſo immenſe a number of copies, as are now (ſince Printing) of the Bible amongſt Proteſtants. Yet are not we of opinion, that the Scriptures are either not profitable, (as Saint* Paul *ſays they are) or not ſufficient (ſuppoſing them to be the written word of God by ſome precedent proof) by way of Rule to make us wiſe unto Salvation. For they contain many of the moſt important points of Religion clearly and expreſſely to all, who are not willfully pertinacious, and what they contain not in particular expreſſions by general rules they refer to the Church, and the chief Governors of it, to learn them from their mouths, or from the Univerſal Tradition of Chriſtendome. But that every particular Chriſtian is to receive and know what he is to believe, what not, by his ſole peruſal of Gods written word, as though every particular point of Chriſtian Faith were particularly ſet down in it, or by particular reſpective conſequences, or other particular proofs concerning every ſuch point to be deduced from it, is ſo great a Paradox; that no man (I think) who hath his right ſenſes can averr it. For beſides the unlearned, which is the far greater part of Chriſtendome, whereof a very great part know neither to write nor read, and therefore depend upon the credit of others, what are the words of Scripture; or if they can read, know no other ſave their Mothers tongue, and thereby are ſubject to a thouſand miſconſtructions of the words or Phraſes in the Original; or*

if

if they arrive to the knowledge of the original, know not the true Rules of interpretation of Scripture, and thereby run into errors; or if they know them, out of Pride, or ſelf-conceit of their own wit and judgment, will not apply them: And as to the Learned, ſeeing they, after all their induſtry, skill in Languages, comparing one place with another, &c. are yet ſo far from according one with another in the interpretation of divers places of Scripture touching points of Faith controverted, that there is no hope after 150 years diſcord they will ever come to an agreement.

But ſuppoſe ſome learned men might have a greater inſight into Scripture, and approach nearer to the ſenſe of it, then thoſe that are leſs learned, or the ignorant; yet Scripture interpreted by private mens judgment cannot be a ſufficient Rule of Faith, or means to obtain it. For the Rule and means appointed by almighty God to attain Faith, muſt be common and univerſal to all ſorts of Chriſtians; nor muſt there be one rule and means for the learned, and another for the unlearned. Seeing Scripture cannot be ſufficiently interpreted by the ſole means of Scripture by the unlearned, , as I have ſhewed, and Scripture interpreted by private men cannot be the Rule and Means appointed by Almighty God for the guiding of conſciences in all points of Faith, there muſt therefore be ſome other for the unlearned, and conſequently for all. Now this other means and rule can be no other excogitable (unleſs we run to the Sole private Spirit of Phanatiques, which is more abſurd then all the reſt,) ſave the direction and univerſal Tradition of Gods Catholick Church, as is above declared.

As to your laſt ſentence, I acknowledg, That he who can anſwer theſe Queries may anſwer mine, and the ſame ſubſtantial anſwer mutatis mutandis, *will ſatisfie a good conſcience in both. Nor did I ever think my Queries unanſwerable: for I know I could anſwer them my ſelf, or any one may do, who aſſents to the Principles of the Roman Church. But I propounded my Queries to Proteſtants, and ſhewed they are unanſwerable by them; and from them only it is, from whom I in this occaſion expect an anſwer.*

N. 2. Now let us weigh the Categorical Anſwers.

To the firſt the Anſwer ſeems to be affirmative. Onely there is ſome dubiouſneſs in the word, Chriſtianity. *For all Hereticks make a viſible profeſſion of* Chriſtianity.

Suppoſing therefore you mean true Chriſtianity in their whole Profeſſion, the Anſwer is accepted.

To the ſecond you add the word, Ordinarily. *If therefore you mean by this, that ſome may be ſaved in extraordinary caſes out of the viſible Church, I take the Anſwer to be affirmative, that ſome may be ſaved out of the viſible Catholick Church, which I think is contrary to the ſtream of all Chriſtian Antiquity.*

The third hath nothing of a Categorical Anſwer. For I demand, amongſt all different pretended profeſſions, which is now the Holy Catholick Church by deſignation of ſome one, or ſome ſet number of Profeſſions now on foot. And you tell me what the Holy Catholick Church is, but give no deſignation of any particular profeſſion or profeſſions of Chriſtians. Or if you intended to make a deſignation, you have anſwered obſcurum per æquè obſcurum, *which can be no Categorical Anſwer. For it is now as obſcure among Chriſtians, which profeſſion that is which now profeſſeth the true Catholick Faith once for all delivered to the Saints*, &c. *as it is, which is now the Holy Catholick Church.*

Your fourth Anſwer is defective ex infufficienti enumeratione partium, *and not Categorical. For I put two parts in my Querie*, Deſtructive of Salvation, or indangering of it.

You anſwer to the firſt, but you ſay nothing to the ſecond; wherein notwithſtanding was the main force of the Querie.

Your fifth Anſwer is not Categorical, becauſe only conditional. You ſay, The Catholick Church ſo long as it continues ſo cannot; &c, *Now this conditional*, So long as it continues ſo, *ſuppoſes, that the Catholick Church can ceaſe to be the Ca-*

tholick Church, which is both contrary to your answer to the first Querie, wherein you grant, that there is in all ages a Visible Catholick Church, and a most damnable error in Christianity. For if the Visible Catholick Church can ever cease to be, Christ who hath promised, it shall ever be, Eph. 4. 10, 11, 12. &c. will become a false Prophet. But suppose, you had given a Categorical Answer, That it can never abstrude false Scripture, &c. then you must grant, that the Catholick Visible Church is infallible in the delivery of Scripture. If so, then is there an Infallible Judg upon the earth concerning this point. If so, I require some satisfactory reason, why the Church should be infallible in this and fallible in other points of Faith, seeing it is as great absurdity to abuse the world with false Faith, as with false Scriptures. Or what authority is there either in Scripture, or Antiquity, which limits the infallibility of the Church to the sole determination of Scripture. Or is it not as pernicious to a Soul to be put in danger of damnation by having a dangerous error taught it by the Church, as by having some Books, happily less dangerous than that error, imposed upon it by the Church.

To your Conclusion I answer. The reason, why you are to desert the Protestant English Church, is not, because it adheres to the Scriptures, as a Rule of Faith, (for the Roman doth that as well as the Protestant,) but because they will have that the sole Rule, in exclusion of Universal Tradition, and the voice of the Catholick Church,

Nor is it any reason to refuse to join with the Roman Church, because it enjoyns one to renounce his Senses and Reason. For it enjoyns this no more, than Scripture and the Protestant Church does. For was not Lot to deny his Senses, when he perceived them to be Angels, whom his eyes ears and touch taught him to be living men? And how could our Saviour pass through a whole crowd of people, and neither be seen, heard, or felt, without a deception of the Senses? Now it is far more opposite to humane reason, to believe one to be three, and three to be one, and that in the very self same being without any difference, or mutation, then to believe bread to be changed into flesh, or one body to be in more places at once.

What

What you say of breach of Charity, is misconceit of our doctrine. We censure not the Persons, but the Doctrine, and that maintained pertinaciously and obstinately. Now who does so, we cannot absolutely judg, and therefore pass no absolute judgment upon particulars. And this is so far from breach of Charity, that it is only out of Charity, that we let Protestants know, what danger they are in, that they may avoid it; whereas otherwise we should be Flatterers and Sycophants in letting them go on securely in the danger we conceive them to be in.

The Council of Trent *composed no new Creed, at all, but gave a Catalogue of such points to be professed by all those, who were to teach in publick Academies, before they were admitted to that office. As the English Protestants do exact a profession of the* 39 *Articles of such as she admits to Orders. I have nothing to do with the proof of any thing, till these Queries be answered by Protestants.*

Fourth Section, containing an Examination of the foregoing Reply made by the Romanist; which was comprised in a Letter to the Gentleman assaulted, Mr. F. M.

SIR,

I Received the Papers, which you conveyed unto me by many Ambages, on the 12*th.* of *April*; since which time I have been intangled in several businesses, that allowed me no leisure to consider the Cavils of the Factors for the Court of Rome; who are like the Clients of * the Idol God of *Ekron*, the Flies, not only for their insinuation into secrets; but also for their restless importunity, who though beaten off from the flesh, they would taint and corrupt, yet return again. But now, though enough hath been lately published by eminent persons in our

* Beelzebub, *the Lord of Flyes*, 2. Reg. i, 2, 3. *the Prince of Devils.* Musca est meus pater: clam illum nihil haberi potest. Plaut.

our Church, to ſtop the mouths of gainſayers or at leaſt to ſecure prudent readers from the dangerous practiſes of thoſe, who like *Elymas* ceaſe not to pervert the ſtreight
Act. 13. 10. waies of the Lord; yet I have taken ſome ſpare time to examine what is returned to that Paper, which you know *Sir*, I writ in your Dining-room whilſt you ſtaid a while for your company to dinner. Upon the peruſal I find nothing, that may render the defence of mine own former writing ſo difficult to me, as it may be tedious to you. For you will ſee that Oracle of *Solomon* verified, The beginner
Prov. 17. 14. of ſtrife is like one that opens a paſſage to waters. As waters let in at a ſmall breach quickly ſpread to a deluge: ſo you may obſerve, how contentions about Religion begun by admiſſion of a few queſtions ſwell to Volumes that cloy, or tire rather then inſtruct readers, except they be ſuch lovers of Truth, as to ſeek it with patience. But leaſt my ſilence might give ſome occaſion to the Adverſarie of triumphing over our Church, (whereas indeed neither the validity of our cauſe or profeſſion, nor the credit of our Church depends on ſo weak a *Baſis*, as the acting of one of the meaneſt of her Children) I ſhall endeavour to repair this breach, and to retrench theſe bitter waters of Romiſh contentions againſt the Truth into their own channels. And that you may not be affrighted with the very bulk of my Reply, I ſhall not enlarge my diſcourſe to diſprove every particular, which theſe Papers may tempt me to contradict, but make ſhort animadverſions upon whatever occurs and appears material to our preſent Queries.

My firſt Querie miniſters no occaſion of diſpute. The ſecond, in which he rightly apprehends the main force of my inſtance againſt his Queries to lie, is attacked by him confidently, with ſuch weapons, as I may ſafely truſt you to judge of their validity. And indeed you that are aſſaulted in the poſſeſſion of the truth of Chriſtian Religion, conveyed unto you by the light of Gods Word in the Scripture, which is held forth by a Miniſterie, that doth not

pretend

pretend to Infallibility, but profeſſeth legitimate Authority to inſtruct all under their charge in the Doctrine of the Goſpel, muſt be Judge in the Court of your own conſcience, whether the Roman Queſtioniſt, or I, ſpeak that which is agreeable to the common Rules of Truth. And your Reaſon aſſiſted with the bleſſing of God, the Father of Lights, who freely and liberally gives wiſdom ſufficient to ſalvation unto all, that with humility, meekneſs and reſolution of obedience implore his holy Spirit of underſtanding, muſt be permitted to be your Guide in diſcovering the True Church from the Falſe; and may as well and ſafely be allowed to diſtinguiſh the wholeſome Doctrine from the corrupt and noxious: ſince this may be eaſier and ſooner diſcerned by the agreeableneſs of any Doctrine to the ſence of Scripture, in which all things neceſſary are plain, then the truth of a Church can be diſcovered by thoſe Notes commonly given by the Papiſts, which are uncertain, variable, difficult to be examined, and (which is of moſt importance) not infallibly known to be the infallible Notes of a True Church, nor infallibly applied to their Church, except you will take their Teſtimony of themſelves to be infallible, which is the thing in queſtion.

But not to make unneceſſary excurſions, I ſhall betake my ſelf to examine his Anſwer to my ſecond Querie. I will not waſte time to unfold the Logical term, *Ignoratio Elenchi*, though I can ſhew how unjuſtly this fallacy is charged upon me, and how eaſily it may be retorted upon him. I ſhall appeal to your reaſon, and leave you to determine, who is guilty of miſtaking the Argument in debate, or of proceeding fallaciouſly. He thinks, he hath convinced me of ſuch a ſophiſtical dealing, by ſaying, That the Queries about the Chriſtian Church, to which thoſe propounded by me ought to correſpond, proceed not upon any particular Kingdom, no nor upon any particular Church. But I deſire you to conſider, whether there be not an exact analogy (as to the ſufficient way and means

means of ſalvation) between the Chriſtian Church under the Goſpel diffuſed through all Nations, and the Jewiſh Church, which was the only Nation, which had then the peculiar priviledge to be in Covenant with God, and to enjoy the living Oracles of truth; and whether there be not a juſt correſpondence in the obligation, that lies upon the members of either Church, both to ſerve God ſincerely according to his will revealed in his Word, and alſo at the ſame time to yield obedience to their Superiors in the Lord, and according to that Law, which was given to Prince and Prieſts and People. The whole Kingdom of *Iſrael* at firſt, as it was undivided, was the only Church of God: And the Kingdom of *Judah*, after the Rent, was the only Spouſe of God, till ſhe had a Bill of Divorce for her ſpiritual whoredoms. And therefore let any indifferent Reader judge, whether I proceeded not upon a good ground, when I compared the preſent Catholick Church, with the only Church, though then confined to one Nation, ſince both are equally furniſhed by God with ſufficient means to preſerve Religion, and both are equally liable to corruption in their members, and if you will believe St. *Paul*'s warning to the Church of *Rome*, the viſible Roman Church is more then equally with that of the Jews obnoxious to a grand apoſtacy and exciſion.

Rom. 11. 18.-22.

[There is indeed one difference between the particular members of the Jewiſh Church under the Law, and particular Chriſtians under the Goſpel, for which the condition of Gods ſervants under the Old Teſtament was much harder, then ours is under the New. For the preſcript ſervice of God being of old tied to the Temple at *Hieruſalem*, and the people being bound to worſhip God there, when the Temple was ſhut up, and the worſhip of the Lord wholly laid down, as under King *Ahaz*, (read 2 *Chron.* 29. 7.) or when the City and Temple were polluted and prophaned with the execrable Altars and Images of *Baal*, of the Sun, and of the Hoſt of Heaven, and Devil-worſhip which were ſet up by *Manaſſeh*, who required obedience

of

of Priests and People, and filled *Jerusalem* with the blood of them who chose to obey God rather than Man. (See 2 *Chron.* 33. 3,9. 2. *Kings* 24. 4.) Gods faithful servants must needs have been in a sad streight between their zeal for Gods House and service, and their obligation to their superiors, who caused, at least urged them to err, and to do worse then the Heathen (as the Holy Ghost speaks in that story) when there was no appearance (as this Romanist fondly dreams) of a standing Council assistant to the High Priest resident at *Hierusalem*, as a Visible guide in Gods way, but the Priest that shewed their heads were all Sycophants and Seducers. But now the Service of God being spiritual and not tyed to any one place, nor the Law of Christ confined to one Bishops chair only, but the Church being spred throughout all nations, and every Church, that is associated orderly in any Kingdom, or Nation, or being endowed with a sufficient power of conduct and government, (in which the Christian Magistrate is concerned) if a prevalent party of Governours be not only corrupted in matters of Religion, but also so abusive of power, that the communion with that Church be unsafe, Christians are much more at liberty than the Jews were, because by removal of their habitation they may leave a gangrened limb of the Catholick Church, and joyn to a sounder part, where they may, be it in the East, or in the West, offer a pure oblation and incense unto God with acceptance upon the Altar Christ Jesus. This advantage of freedom and safety for the Service of God, and working out their own salvation, a Christian gains above a Jew by the propagation of the Gospel unto the Gentiles, and the settlement of particular Churches in several Territories under several jurisdictions. But still the parallel holds between Jews and Christians, both in regard of their duty to God, and their Governours, and in respect also of the provision for their eternal Salvation, when the iniquity of the times is such, that their Governours will either make the people committed to their charge drunk

Joh. 4 21, 24. *Malac.* 1. 11. *Heb.* 13. 10. 15.

with

Apoc. 14. 8. & 17. 6. with the poysoned wine of their fornications, or make themselves drunk with the blood of Martyrs]

But he goes on to tell us, that his Queries proceed upon the Representative Catholick Church in a full and lawful meeting of the chief Pastors to teach the Church diffusive what she is to believe as matters of Faith, or to reject as errors in Faith; when Questions arise about any of them.

1. Now *Sir*, again I appeal to your reason, 1. whether you did apprehend, or could divine, or by any thing in those Queries imagine, that by the Visible Catholick Church (which he supposes must be consulted as the Guide of Salvation) is to be understood a truly general Council lawfully assembled.

But now you may be satisfied, that when the Papists make a noyse, with crying up the Catholick Church, they do not mean the Body of the Christian Church diffusive over the whole earth, which though it cannot err in matters of Faith necessary to Salvation (for then, it should cease to be a Church by not holding the head Christ Jesus) yet can not this be a Guide, because it cannot be consulted by particular Christians, or others, who having got an incling of the truth, and desirous of Salvation, may be inquisitive for a Guide. And though every Christian which is a sound member of the Catholick Church, by holding the true Faith, and being ready to joyn upon every good occasion with all his Fellow-members in the worship of God through Christ Jesus according to the Rules of the Gospel, be obliged to communicate his Light to any man that wants it, yet is not every man that agrees with the Catholick Church, an Infallible Guide: And less than Infallibility will not serve a papists turn when he talks of a Guide, though the poor souls in that *Synagogue* never see any but such Guides, which are confessedly fallible, because Infallibility is not the Lot of particular Priests.

And now being instructed to take their meaning (which was a secret not to be foreseen) for their saying, I hope you

you have not forgot, what you have heard my Lord *Falkland* often say, The Pastors assembled in Council, though a governing part, are still but a part of the Church Catholick; and this may be secured from the gates of Hell, though they may be permitted to err in matters of Faith.

But allowing all due honour of Reverence and Obedience to a truly General Council lawfully assembled in the name of Christ, and proceeding sincerely by the assistance of the Holy Ghost; I desire you to consider, how particular Christians are by this mans explication of the word, *Church*, set forward in the way to find that which is pretended to be absolutely necessary, to wit, an Infallible Guide in matters of Faith, and holy Life. You know, that, after the Apostles had finished their course, the Church subsisted upon the stock of their doctrine, with an ordinary Ministry erected and supported by Christ in several Churches respectively, for many years, and some ages without a general Council. Yet particular Christians had all that while a sufficiency of certain means for the conduct of their Souls in the wayes of Truth, Peace, and Holyness, unto eternal life. And therefore doth it not appear evident, that there was Salvation attained without a Church in the sense of this Querist? But never was there Salvation out of the Catholick Church. I pray marke now, who is ignorant of, or wilfully mistakes the Argument we treat of, the Querist, or the Respondent? 2.

Thirdly, I desire you to consider, in what a wilderness you are intangled, without certain path, or issue, if once you be perswaded to forsake your ordinary Guides, who lead you not by their own light, but by the Lanthorn they hold forth, which enables you to judge of their leading and your own walking in the right way, and then to look for this Chimerical Guide called the Church. For you know, 1. General Councils are not standing Guides. 2. And how shall particular Christians be infallibly assured, (and less then that, according to the common Hypo- 3.

 thesis

theſis of Papiſts, will not ſerve for a ground of divine Faith) that a Council when it is aſſembled is truly a full meeting of only lawful Paſtors, and that they proceed ſo as to be aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt, ſince the Learned are not agreed on the Conditions requiſite to make the Body of an Aſſembly fit for the ſpirit of Infallibility; and the unlearned are never able by diſquiſition to be aſſured that the Council which pretends to be their Guide is juſtly qualified to be ſo.

3. Again 3. Remember how ſilent Councils are in caſes of conſcience, and particular matters of holy life; in which there is as much danger, if you miſtake the way, of ruſhing into Hell, as in matters of Faith. If reaſon and ordinary Paſtors, without any fancy of infallibility, can apply Scripture-Light to guide our feet certainly in the way to Heaven, why is there more neceſſity of a Council to teach us matters of Faith, than to inſtruct us in holyneſs of life? Miſtake me not: I acknowledg the Authority of Councils as uſeful for the preſervation of Peace, and for the more vigorous ſuppreſſion of falſe teachers, which corrupt the truth. But I ſee no abſolute neceſſity of that extraordinary power to teach the Church diffuſive the form of wholeſome Doctrine eſtabliſhed now by the Conſent of Ages to the Faith once delivered to the Saints.

4. But ſuppoſing a general lawful Council to be the only teacher, to be truſted, how ſhall particular Chriſtians be infallibly aſſured of their Doctrine, the knowledg whereof is conveyed by no other means, but ſuch as are confeſſedly fallible? And therefore you will ſtill be to ſeek for a ſufficient Guide according to the Senſe of this Grand-Signior. All the objections made againſt the Holy Scriptures as they are uſed for inſtruments to diſcover the truth and the will of God (which certainly they were by God deſigned to be, for the benefit of the People as well as Paſtors) will be more forcibly urged to the diſenabling the Canons of Councils from being a certain Rule of Faith,

than

than they can be to the degrading of Scripturer from that dignity in the Church: Since the words of a Council in the original cannot be plainer nor more expreſſive of the mind of God, then thoſe which the eternal Wiſdome and Holy Spirit of God immediately directed the Penmen of Scripture to endite: And their Tranſlations into Vulgar Languages are ſubject at leaſt to as many uncertainties as the Tranſlations of the Bible; And laſtly there will ſtill be wanting a living infallible Judg, that ſhall expound and apply the Canons of Councils to particular Chriſtians, which may be called with leſs danger of Blaſphemy, a Dead Letter and a Lesbian Rule, then the Holy Scriptures are, when they are defamed by ſuch diſparaging Characters faſtned upon thoſe Holy Oracles of God by Popiſh writers, who are, as the antient Hereticks, *Lucifuga Scripturarum.*

But notwithſtanding his reprehenſion of me for a feigned correſpondence between the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Church, yet at laſt to maintain the infallibility of general Councils (which, if granted, comes very ſhort of making good his deſign, that we ſhould miſtake the Roman Church for the Catholik, and the factious Conventicles of Italy packed by the Pope to ſerve the intereſt of the Court of Rome for Legitimate Councils) He will be an Advocate for the Synagogue. And rather, then the Succeſſors of the Scribes and *Phariſees* (who imitate their crimes, and inherite their woes denounced by our bleſſed Saviour againſt them) ſhall loſe their priviledg of Infallibility, the Jews, that in their conſiſtory perſecuted *David*, murdered the Prophets, ſet up Idols in the Temple of God, corrupted Religion, and condemned our Saviour the Truth it ſelf, ſhall have the Gift of Infallibility fined upon them. What ſhort-ſighted men are other Papiſts in compariſon of this *Illuminado*, who derive the Pedegree of an Infallible Guide from St. *Peter*; when this man deduces it from the Scribes and Phariſees, whom Chriſt calls openly Blind Guides, and from the *Sanhedrim* at *Jeru-* *Mat.* 23. 24.

Psal. 2. 2. *Jeruſalem*, who, as the Holy Ghoſt ſays, took counſel againſt the Lord and againſt his anoynted?

Obſerve what he ſays; *viz.* If I had proved efficaciouſly, that the High Prieſt with his forenamed Council taught the people Idolatry or any other breach of Gods Law to be lawful, *&c.* I had overthrown the whole fabrick of his Queries.

Indeed I offered no large proof of it to you *Sir*, whom I know to be ſo very well verſed in the Law and the Prophets, that you could not be ignorant of the ſtory and the Sermons, which record plainly and reprove ſharply, the horrid crimes of the Prieſts and Elders, (whether in Council, or out of Council, it matters not; ſince neither place, nor company did change their manners) in corrupting Religion, in ſeducing the People (which certainly was done by doctrine as much as by example, and by Authority abuſed in both) in perſecuting the Prophets, and in complying with Idolatrous Kings to the erecting Idols and Altars to them in the houſe and City of God, to the ſhutting up of the Temple, and extinguiſhing the Lamps, and which is worſe than all this, to the rejecting of the very Books of the Law, that the people might not ſee that Light, which would reprove their deeds of darkneſs. I may ask the Queriſt, as St. *Paul* did K. *Agrippa*, Believeſt thou the *Prophets*? But I dare not anſwer for him as St. *Paul* did for the King, I know that thou believeſt them. For indeed the Prophets aſſure us, that the Prieſts, (whoſe lips ſhould have kept knowledg, and ſhould have taught the people the true way of ſerving God, and therefore the people were bound to ſeek the law from the mouth of Gods appointed Meſſenger; but were not tyed to receive chaff inſtead of wheat, much leſs poiſon inſtead of wine) were themſelves departed out of the way, and cauſed many to ſtumble at the Law, and broke the covenant of *Levi*. And notwithſtanding their vain preſumption, controlled by the Prophet *Ezekiel* (which you ſee is taken up by their ſucceſſor) that the Law ſhould not periſh from the

Read 2. Chron. 36. 14. Ezek 8. 5. to the end.

Act. 26. 27.

Jer. 32. 28. Mal. 2. 7. 8.

Ezek. 7. 26. Jer. 18. 18.

the Prieſt, yet they that handled the law knew not the Lord, the *Paſtors* alſo were brutiſh, and tranſgreſſed againſt God. Jer. 2. 8. & 10. 21.

But though the prevarications of the Prieſts in the Law, and their ſeductions of the credulous people to their ruine (for if the blind lead the blind, and none were ſo blind as Gods ſervants and meſſengers, were in the Prophet *Eſays* daies, that they not both fall into the ditch) be written with a pen of Iron, and graven with the point of a diamond upon the horns of their altars, yet this Queriſt would have told a Jew that inquired for the good old way, that the Prophets of the Lord were miſtaken. For he ſays he hath clearly ſhewed a Jew of thoſe times, that the High Prieſt then in being (ſuppoſe for example, *Uriah* the Prieſt who to pleaſe King *Ahaz* ſet up an Illegitimate Altar according to the pattern of one at *Damaſcus*, and ſet aſide the Altar of the Lords appointment) with his crew of Court-paraſites was the true viſible Church, to whoſe word and practiſe the whole people of God were bound to ſtand and conform. Eſa. 42. 19, 20. Mat. 15. 14. Jer. 17. 1.

SIR, I know not what apprehenſions you may have of this mans extolling the Jewiſh Prieſt with contradiction to Gods Prophets: But I cannot without horror look upon the diſcourſe, becauſe I foreſee the conſequence of it, and diſcover the driſt of it, which is to palliate, yea too juſtify, the Doctrines of Devils taught, and the Superſtitious and Idolatrous practices in the preſent Church of Rome, which are as reconcileable to the ſecond Commandement, and that of Chriſt, Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve, as the Calf in the deſert, and thoſe at *Dan* and *Bethel*, and the worſhip of *Baal* were conſiſtant with the Law of *Moſes*. Mat. 4. 10.

But that which the Prophets have done, he ſays is impoſſible for me to do, unleſs I enervate the words of our Saviour, *Mat.* 23. 2, 3. God forbid, that I ſhould attempt to enervate the words of him that is the Truth it ſelf; but give me leave to ſhew you, if you do not already clear-

ly

ly perceive, that there are no ſinews in his diſcourſe ſtrong enough to tye Infallibility to the Chair, in which the Scribes and Phariſees ſate.

To paſs by the obſervation of ſome learned expoſitors, that by the chair of *Moſes* (our Saviour did not mention the chair of *Aaron*, the High Prieſt, to whom alone this man no friend to Soveraign Magiſtrates confines the recourſe of Gods people) is meant, not ſo much the Spiritual Authority, (as the Queriſt preſumes) as the Civil Power, the Remains whereof yet indulged by the Roman Conqueror to the Jews our Saviour would have preſerved. Let us allow that Chriſt enjoyns Obedience both to the Civil and to the Spiritual power then exerciſed by the Governors of that Nation. What then? Do precepts of Obedience to our mortal ſuperiors neceſſarily infer Infallibility in Parents, who are but the Fathers of our fleſh, or in Princes, who though they be the Sons of God, and as the Angels of God, yet may fall as one of thoſe celeſtial Princes? Are they thereby ſo priveledged, that they can never enjoyn any thing ſo repugnant to Gods word, as that the inferior ſhall be driven for tryal of his Faith to the choice of obeying God, rather than man? But though Kings are not made infallible, when they are inveſted with a divine power, albeit *Solomon* ſays, that a Prov. 16. 10. Divine Sentence is in the lips of the King, and his mouth tranſgreſſeth not in judgement, and their ſubjects are tyEccl. 8. 2. ed by the Oath of God to keep the Kings commandement; yet Prieſts, it may be, have a priviledg above Kings. You ſee, what theſe men would be at, and you may quickly diſcover their intention to ſeclude Magiſtrates from medling with Religion, when he ſays, that the Jews in queſtions about Religion were not to have the laſt refuge to the Kings. But the ſacred Hiſtory informs us abundantly, that the Kings of Gods people were the Guardians of the Law, and governed the Prieſts; and the Religious Kings by their ſevere edicts eſtabliſhed the true Religion, and reformed the Church, as well as the State,

and

and preſt the Prieſts (of themſelves otherwiſe backward) to attend their charge, and to teach the people, ſo that a zealous Jew might with better ſucceſs have made his reſort to an *Ezekiah*, or a *Joſiah*, then to ſome cheif Prieſts and Paſtors, that had been infected with the faſhions of an Idolatrous Court.

But not to inſiſt more on that, conſider the impudence of this man, who faſtens upon our bleſſed Saviour that which he was ſo far from ſaying, that he ſays elſewhere the contrary. For he affirms, that *Chriſt ſayes that the Scribes and Phariſees were infallible, becauſe they ſate in Moſes's Chair*, and ſo governed the Church of God ſucceſſively and faithfully in matter of doctrine, whence he concludes, that neither their predeceſſors, nor they, could teach Error in faith or manners. As I have evinced by the Prophets, that the Predeceſſors of the Scribs and Phariſees (or rather the Prieſts and Elders which commonly bear the name of the Church) were ſo far from Infallibility, that God himſelf for their teaching lies, overthrew their Chair; and for their prophaning the Temple, in which they vainly truſted when they turned it into a den of thieves, God deſerted his own habitation, and laid it waſt: So he that reads the Goſpel will quickly perceive this figment of Infallibility, (not ſo much uſurped by Scribs and Phariſees, themſelves, as pinned upon them by Papiſts,) overthrown by our Saviour Chriſt were they ſecured from error in expounding the Law, and teaching the people the ſenſe thereof, whoſe partial righteouſneſs our Saviour condemns as inconſiſtent with true juſtice, and whoſe corrupt gloſſes Chriſt confutes, and oppoſes his own authority to their comments which adulterated the meaning of Gods law. But becauſe it may be ſaid, that this was a defect in them for want of light and ſpiritual obedience was the proper Doctrine of the Goſpel, ſo that this is not enough to convince the Scribes and Phariſees of error in Doctrine; I anſwer, that St. *Paul* ſays the Law is in it ſelf ſpiritual, and it was a groſs ſeducing the people in faith and manners, to teach ſuch carnal Doctrines as

Mat. 5. 20. &c.

Rom. 7. 14.

in-

incouraged and hardned men in ſin, and kept them from repenting of their vain thoughts and vile luſts, which lodged in their hearts. But to go a ſtep further. Chriſt that commanded obedience to them, (which neceſſarily muſt be limited by the ſtanding and known Laws of Gods people) expreſly warns his Diſciples to beware of the Leaven of their Doctrine. If Chriſt did by the Precept alledged evidently ſuppoſe (as the Queriſt ſays) that the Scribes and Phariſees could teach the people no error in faith and manners, then why did our Saviour go about to ſecure his Diſciples by ſuch a Caution, whereas they had no reaſon to ſuſpect that which the Scribes and Phariſees offered them for the food of their ſouls? Their very ſitting in *Moſe's* Chair was a ſufficient aſſurance, that they were as faithful in the Houſe of God as *Moſes*, (if you will take this mans word, Chriſt meant and ſaid ſo) and were ſo wiſe as they could not be miſtaken, and ſo honeſt as they would not give ſowr Leaven inſtead of heavenly Manna. Oh brave Patron of the accurſed Scribes and Phariſees! But Sir, I believe you have read the 23 Chapter of St. *Matthew* throughout, wherein our Saviour ſets out thoſe blind Guides, and abominable Hypocrites, who had the Key of knowledg (as the Pope pretends to the cuſtodie of St. *Peter's* Keys) in ſuch deteſtable characters, as are inconſiſtent with Infallibility. But ſome will ſay, their corruption in manners doth not infer their erroneouſneſs in Doctrine, and therefore Pope *Alexander* the 6th. though a Devil incarnate, might be infallible in the Chair, as a learned Lady of the Romiſh ſide, whom you knew, once told me. I anſwer, that it will be hard to perſwade a ſober Chriſtian that hath reverent apprehenſions of Gods holy Spirit, that the Spirit of Diſcipline will abide with ſuch unrighteouſneſs and uncleanneſs, or that perſons immerſed in worldly luſts ſhould enjoy the conſtant preſence and influence of that Spirit which leads humble and holy men into all truth. But he that can perſwade you that they, whom Chriſt calls blind Guides, were not only

Mat. 16. 11, 12.

Luk. 11. 52.

Wiſd. 1. 5.

See Joh. 14. 17.

Mat. 15. 14

fit but alſo infallible Directors, may with the ſame confidence and arguments make you believe that the Sun ſhines in our Horizon at midnight.

I do not forget, that it is not the Pope's Infallibility, but a Councils, which the Queriſt pleads for by the example of the Scribes and Phariſees, albeit they were perhaps Doctors of the Law, but few of them members of the great Council. But I touch this briefly, becauſe it may be the next Papiſt, that creeps into your familiarity, will be for the Pope; or perhaps this perſon, who hath in his ſecond Paper reſolved the Catholick Church into a Council, will in his next Paper melt down a Council into the Pope, which is the more likely to be a Guide, becauſe a living perſon to be conſulted with, if many reaſons did not hinder our acceptance of him for an infallible one.

But that the Scribes and Phariſees were guilty of teaching for Doctrines obligatory of conſcience, the traditions of men, and did by their devices annul the Commandements of God, and encourage men under pretence of Religious Vows, to diſobey their parents, and by falſe Doctrines involved ſouls in the guilt of perjury, is evident by our Saviours convicting and condemning them. Can you now be of the opinion, that this ungodly fraternity of Villains could make up an infallible Conſiſtory by poſſeſſing the Chair of *Moſes*? If you can entertain ſuch a conceit, you bleſs whom Chriſt hath curſed, and put darkneſs for light, and call blind Guides the Seers, and ſo draw down the woe upon your ſelf. Indeed ſuch Guides are fit for them, who wilfully wink againſt the light, and make themſelves ſlaves to the enemies of true Religion, who put out the eyes of their captived Proſelytes, that they may with quiet grind in their Mills.

Mat. 15. 3. —9.

Mat. 23. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20.

Eſa. 5. 20.

I will conclude my Reply to this Paragraph with one Propoſal. This Queriſt defers ſuch honour to the Jewiſh Prieſthood, that the Prieſts ought to be ſimply believed upon their word till *Shiloh* came, becauſe they or at leaſt a Council of them could not erre in faith.

I will not instance in the Council that condemned our Saviour, because, although some plead for *Caiphas* by vertue of his Priesthood to have been inspired by the Holy Ghost which alwayes assisted the Chair, yet perhaps this Querist will not extend the continuance of Infallibility thus far: And yet he that hath feigned Christ to assign it to the Scribes and Pharisees, cannot give a good and solid account how *Caiphas* and his Confederates came in that critical hour to lose it, or why the people without a manifest Declaration of God to abrogate their Authority, should not then also be bound to believe their sentence, though it were blasphemy, and tended to the murder of the Son of God; or how *Joseph of Arimathea* could be absolved (according to this mans principles) from being an Heretick and Schismatick, for not consenting to the counsel and practice of the High Priest with his Assembly, for which very thing the Gospel commends him to be a good and a just person, since at that very time the whole Nation of the Jews were obliged, (according to this mans assertions) by Christs own injunction, to rest in the Doctrine and Determination of the Council of *Jerusalem*, as infallible in matters of Religion, and consequently to deny Jesus to be the Christ. Think of this seriously. But there is another instance which I aim at. It is well known, that in the degenerate estate of the Jews there started up a powerful Sect of the Sadducees. These, though pretending to adhere unto the Law of *Moses*, yet are noted to have been infected with pernicious errors in Religion, for they believed not any world of Spirits present or to come; and therefore denied the existence of Angels or Spirits departed, and the resurrection of the body by the return of souls to resume their earthly tabernacles repaired. The heads of this Heresie were the chief of the Nation, and as it fell out in the vicissitude of Priests, (whose office was made venal by the Court) the High Priest himself was sometimes a Sadducee. (Read *Act.* 4. 1, and 5. 17.) when such an Heretick possest the

Luk. 23. 50, 51.

Act. 5. 17.

Mat. 22. 23
Act. 23. 8.

Chair

Chair of *Moſes*, or *Aaron*, who underſtood not *Moſes* aright, (as our Saviour aſcribes the error of the Sadducees to their ignorance of the Scriptures) you may be ſure that men of the ſame judgement made up the greater part of the *Sanhedrim*. For the animoſity of the Sadducees againſt the Phariſees, together with their intereſt in the Nobility, was ſuch, that they would not allow many birds of another feather to pearch upon the ſame branch of Authority, though one Phariſee *Gamaliel* once was permitted to be of the Council. Now then if a Jew loth to rely on his own underſtanding ſhould deſire to be inſtructed in this main Article of Religion, which is the chief root of obedience and ſupporter of patience, to whom ſhould he repair, and whom ſhould he believe? If you will take the Queriſts word, The High prieſt with his Council was the true viſible Church to be hearkned unto. But if they declared their own ſenſe (and no body can reaſonably imagine that they would contradict themſelves, or as *Balaam* once was ſo they all being met together in Council ſhould by a powerful Enthuſiaſm be conſtreined to ſpeak contrary to their own mind, and deliver that Truth which they did not approve in their own conſciences, and ſhould in ſpeaking Truth lye by the power of the Holy Ghoſt) the inquiſitive Jew was bound (contrary to the general ſentiment of the 12 Tribes, which did in the Expectation of a Reſurrection (called the hope of Iſrael) ſerve God day and night) to become a Sadducee, to diſbelieve *Moſes*, and to condemn himſelf to an everlaſting death, which ſhould ſwallow up his perſon and his piety, and ſeparate him for ever from having any communion with the God of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, & *Jacob*. If the Council it ſelf ſhould happen to be divided by factions, and interrupted by clamour and violence from determining any thing, as it was the fate of the Council, to which the Apoſtle *Paul* appeared, then what is become of the Viſible Guide? Or how ſhall the Jews conſcience be ſatisfied of this fundamental doctrine? Certainly he muſt remain a Sceptick, and that is next de-

See Act. 26. 6, 7.

Act. 23.

gree to Atheiſt, if he do not find a clear Rule and a firm Rock, whereon to build his holy faith, which is the ground of a holy life. And if he do, he need not look for an Infallible Guide, which if he have yet the vain curioſity to ſeek for, he will never have the good hap to find.

I leave you now to judge of this mans reſolution of my Queries.

And though he be like the Scribes and Phariſees in his induſtry to make Proſelytes, yet I have no fear of you, but that you can diſcern the fraudulent courſe he takes to perſwade, and diſcover the ſad end to which he leads his abuſed followers.

Since now I have out of Gods word evinced that the Prieſts of the Jews, high and low, were not only corrupt in their private manners, but alſo groſſely ignorant of Gods Law, and ſeducers of the people from the true ſervice of God, and ſuborners of falſe prophets (for that alſo may juſtly be taken into conſideration) for the ſupport of their credit and power with the people, and imployed their Judicial power to condemn the true Prophets, I have done enough (mine Adverſary himſelf being Judg) to overthrow the frame of his Queries, which were ſet up, as a Gate or Bulwark of Hell to maintain the Devils deviſe, The Infallibility of the Church of Rome maſked with the ſpecious Title of the Catholick Church. And becauſe I have alſo by our bleſſed Saviours ſermons and ſentence ſhewed the impiety as much as abſurdity of honouring the Scribes and Phariſees with a priviledg of Infallibility, I have ſaid all that I conceive requiſite concerning his anſwer to my ſecond and third Queries, which he reſolves thus: The Jewiſh Church underſtood *ut ſupra*, (that is, the Paſtors of the Church repreſenting the whole, and acting with authority for the government of the people) could not teach any error as matter of divine Faith or Religion. Only take this Corollary. He muſt have a mind able to ſwallow and concoct Tranſubſtantiation, that can believe,

See Jer. 5. 31.

Mat. 23. 37.

lieve, these Idolatrous Pastors, so often complained of by God, could do all this mischeif in the Church, if they had been as dumb dogs in the Devils cause, as they were in Gods, and as silent for teaching any error in matter of Religion, as they were in the instructing of men in the true way of God: Or that these ignorant and debauched Priests being consulted concerning the Law of God would, or should of necessity by a secret and powerful instinct of an Infallible *Genius* perpetually waiting upon them, at least inspiring them upon such occasions, teach the people contrary to their own perswasions and practise.

See Jer. 2. 26, & 23. 1, 2. Read Esa. 56. 10, 11. Certainly blind watchmen, dumb and yet greedy dogeShepherds, that could not understand, were but sorry Guides, and as far from being infallible teachers of Religion, as Hell is from Heaven.

To the fourth Querie, *&c.* The vanity, falshood and impiety of the precedent Answers to my 3 counter Queries being sufficiently evidenced, it may seem superfluous to disprove what he builds upon the sand, because this will sink of it self with the unsound foundation. But because from that absurd supposition of Infallibility settled in the Jewish Priesthood, he inferrs, that the Jewish Church (he means the Priests, or chief Pastors thereof: for he is much in proving that the people had very little to do with the Bible) by divine direction preserved the Holy Scriptures intire without mutilation or addition of any thing uncanonical, I shall briefly consider this Consequence, which imports that the preservation of Scriptures depends upon the Infallibility of the Priests, or the Church that keeps it. I confess that Gods gratious providence is remarkable in preserving his pretious Word, conteined in the Book of the Law. But I pray you consider how little the Priests above mentioned contributed their care to the conservation of the Scripture. For in the reign of Idolatrous Kings, who sometimes profaned the Temple with Idols, sometimes shut up the doors of it, the Priests, who basely flattered and officiously served their Kings, were so far from considering the Law at all (and much more from reading and teaching it publickly that it might be the rule of Gods service) that in *Josiahs* time the Pentateuch,

teuch, or the whole Law of *Moſes*, or (as ſome think) the Book called *Deuteronomie* being caſually found in the ruines and rubbiſh of Gods houſe; and then read by the High
*Hoſ. 12. 8. Prieſt, was looked upon as * a ſtrange thing, which they were not acquainted withal. But though Prieſts were ſometimes careleſs Depoſitaries, yet God inſpired ſuch a Love of the Law into many of his People, both Prieſts, Levites, and Laicks, that that ineſtimable Juel was never loſt, which God would have preſerved to be the Standard of his publick worſhip, the meaſure of private devotion, and the conſtant light to their walking with God and with men in the fear of God.

And notwithſtanding the ſcandalous corruption of the Holy Order it ſelf for a time, pious perſons could then be, and were rationally aſſured, that the Book of the Law, as well as the law of the Lord, was perfect and uncorrupted. And I deſire you to take notice that this is the Principal thing which is aimed at by way of inſtance or retortion to his fift Querie. For if a direct true Anſwer be given to my fourth Querie, it will follow by Analogie, that Chriſtians may be as perfectly aſcertained of the integrity of the Canon of Scriptures, though the major or more eminent part of Biſhops (the Biſhop of Rome not exempted) ſhould be infected with Arianiſm, as once it happened, and although all the Biſhops of the Roman Church (which the Queriſt would fain have us to take for the Catholick; but can never perſwade us that a member of a Body is the whole, as we can never believe that The Tyrrhene Sea is the whole Ocean) do teach errors as matters of Chriſtian Faith. Now this being the deſign of my Queſtion, by getting out of a Papiſts mouth an Anſwer for a Jew to furniſh a good Chriſtian with an Anſwer to a Popiſh Cavil, and to enſnare the Queriſt in his own ginn, he craftily ſlips the Queſtion out of the way, and without making any direct anſwer to the Jews inquirie, as he offered to do in handling the former Queries, turns aſide to make an impertinent Harangue concerning private mens uſe of the Scriptures.

Mark,

Mark, I pray, my fourth Querie, and compare the return; and you will see nothing of an Answer in this; That the infallibility of the Jewish Church was the means to preserve the Scriptures entire. The question was not about the means by which the Book of *Moses* was preserved, but about the manner how a Jew might be assured of the integrity of it. Now the truly pious Jew, who with *Jeremy* bemoaned the corruption of the Church by the errors and seducements of the Priests, could not make that Infallibility (which he did not believe, because he saw the contrary) the reason why he believed the Scriptures to be preserved in purity and integrity.

And it is as impertinent to any of my propositions, to proceed, (as he doth) that it follows not thence, that every private person should find out every particular point of Religion by particular or expres proofs out of the written word alone.

For I neither make, nor suppose any such Inference from any thing premised in my fifth Querie. But *Sir*, I would have you take notice, that when we make the Holy Scriptures the Rule of Religion, and Instrument to make us wise unto Salvation, we do not exclude the Authority of those persons whom Christ hath made dispensers of Holy Mysteries; but always suppose the Mynisterie to be a Means appointed for the edifying us in our Holy Faith. Again we allow particular Christians, that are endowed with the Spirit of understanding, which is one of the gifts which Christ received without measure; but hath imparted to all his living members according to his good pleasure in a certain measure, to try the Spirits and as the *Bereans* did, to examine the agreeableness of their lawful pastors Doctrine to the Scripture. And if a Priest (though the highest in a Church) tells Christians, that the Blessed Cup in the Eucharist is not to be given to all them that receive the Holy Bread, or that God may be represented by any picture or devise of men in any shape whatsoever, or that any meer Creature is to be worshiped with religious wor-

Esa. 11.2. Joh. 3.34. Eph. 4.7. Phil. 1.9, 10. Col. 1.9. Act. 17.11.

worſhip, the Sheep of Chriſt, that know their chief Shepherds voice, may uſe their talent of reaſon to try theſe doctrines by the touch-ſtone of truth. But we do not affirm, that it is neceſſary for every Chriſtian to deduce and prove every particular point of Religion out of Scripture. But ſince the faith once delivered to the Saints with the rules of Holy Life are now written for our inſtruction and direction by God himſelf, on purpoſe, that they may be a Light to our feet, and make wiſe the ſimple, and therefore the Teſtimonies of the Lord are clear, ſure and plain in all things that are neceſſary to be believed and practiſed; therefore every one according to the circumſtances of his condition and calling, is bound more or leſs to uſe the means vouchſafed him by Gods providence, and may by diligence ſatisfy his conſcience in building his Faith and Obedience upon *Scriptum eſt*, It is written.

Rom. 15. 4. Hoſ. 8. 12. pſal. 19. 7, 8. Prov. 8. 7, 8. Eſa. 35. 8.

Now let us ſee what our Querift ſayes to prove, that a *Jew was bound to reſt upon the Authority of the Prieſts, (though they were Idolatrous, or infected with Sadduciſm,) he endeavors to invalidate my allegations of the Prophet † *Eſay*, who expreſſely ſayes in the place alledged, The leaders of the people cauſed them to err, and they that are lead of them are deſtroyed. Is it not evident, that leaning upon their leaders hand, and reſting upon their Authority was the peoples ruine? God therefore, not only to ſecure them from ſorcerers (as this man reſtrains the caution) but alſo from all ſeducers whatſoever, who ſurely would pretend divine warrant to gain credit to their erroneous doctrine (for never any one brought falſe doctrine upon the ſtage without a vizard) adviſes his people to have recourſe to the Law and the Teſtimony, not excluding the Miniſterie of the Prieſt and Levite, who were faithful in things concerning God, if any ſuch could be conſulted with (and ſome ſuch God did reſerve in the worſt times) but giving the people liberty, if the Grandees ſpake not according to that manifeſt Rule, to

* The Jews at this day are ſo enſlaved to their Rabbies, that if a Rabbi or wiſeman tell them their Right hand is their left, they are bound to believe it. Now what difference is there between an obſtinate Jew, and an infatuated Papiſt?

† Eſa. 9. 16. Eſa. 8. 20.

diſbelieve

disbelieve them, as destitute of true Light. The Prophet indeed doth not forbid men to resort to the present Pastors of the Church, but allows them the judgement of Discretion, to try the words of their leaders by the Law, which shines brightly enough to enlighten their eyes, that they may discern Chaff from Wheat, and false doctrine from true. Let the next Paper, if it can, shew the contrary: for this offers nothing to that purpose. Till then, and for ever, the Law and Testimony written by Gods special design stand for a Rule of Pastors teaching, and peoples obeying.

Next he brings 2proofs of his assertion out of *Deut.* 17. 8. 12. *Mal.* 2. 4. The Devil could find Scriptures to advance his temptations. But Consider the violence offered to Gods word by this racking it. As to that of *Moses*, there is indeed there an establishment of a High Court without appeal, to whose cognizance are referred all important Controversies about the Law of *Moses*, which being in the whole frame of it divine, gives a tincture of Religion to those causes, that were for the substance Civil, or concerned the outward estate or persons of the people.

Deut. 17. 8. If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, between blood & blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke, &c.

In that Court, the Priests and Levites, who by their office were bound to study the whole Law of God, and fit to expound the political Statutes given by the hand of *Moses* for the government of that Nation, but contrived, enacted and endited by God himself, did sit with the Elders, as Judges. Now judg you, whether the submission required of all Jews being at difference about civil matters to the sentence of that Court, signify any thing to enforce upon Jews an obligation to believe and obey the Priests in all things, when common reason assured them, that their doctrine, practise, and injunctions were contrary to the Law of God? Submission to the sentence of a Supreme Court, (which was necessary for peace to put a period to contentions) did not oblige the party adjudged to believe the sentence to be just, though the aggrieved party had

no remedy till the judg of all the world appear to do right. That thoſe Judges did often turn judgment into wormwood, it is evident by the *Prophets*; and it is well known that that Court ſetled at *Jeruſalem*, having taken to themſelves the power of judging Prophets, did very often condemn the Lords true Prophets. Now what Maſter of reaſon can ever fairly deduce from the outward ſubjection, which was neceſſary both for wrath and Conſcience to, a Supreme Court of Gods inſtitution, though the Judges were not infallible in judicature, That thoſe Prieſts were Infallible teachers of Religion, whoſe word was to be taken and relyed on without refuſal or ſo much as tryal?

As to that of the Prophet *Malachi*, it is ſubtilly done of him to touch it lightly, but fraudulently done to cite it imperfectly. It is enough that I have already ſhewed the full ſenſe of the Prophet, who declares what the *Prieſts* were by their office obliged to do; and from their Dignity and Duty aggravates the crime of the debauched Prieſts of that age, who abuſed both their power and alſo the people. And this ſharp reproof is far enough from proving them then to be infallible.

But this Queriſt ſurely preſumes you to be a Papiſt already, and of that form that is unlicenſed to read the Book of God. Elſe, he could not be ſo ſtupid, as to affirm that which any one but indifferently verſed in the Scriptures knows to be falſe. Or it may be (and that is very likely,) he himſelf is very little acquainted with the Bible, but borrows both his citations of Scriptures by halves, and alſo his Anſwers to them, that are commonly alledged by us, from his deluding Maſters. Otherwiſe how were it poſſible that a diligent reader of Scripture ſhould ſay, (mark his words) *It was far from the Ordinances of* Moſes, *that every private believer had licenſe to peruſe the Scriptures*? When nothing is more inculcated by God, and *Moſes*, then that parents ſhould learn, and teach their children the Law,

bind

bind it about their arms, make Phylacteries of it, and by all means possible derive unto posterity the Ordinances of God and the History of his Providence, which are the subject of the Holy Scriptures. If it be said, that all this they might do without Book, because once in seven years, they heard the Law read, we must then allow the Jews quicker apprehensions and more comprehensive and tenacious memories then we have in our generations. But see the unpardonable ignorance or impudence of this cross-grained Queriſt, who says the Law was to be read once *onely* in seven years, *Dent.* 31. 10, 11. Doth that precept, which enjoyns the Law to be read in the *Panegyris* at the Feast of Tabernacles in the Sabbatical year; include a Prohibition of the Jews to read the Bible by themselves, and to meditate in the Law, day and night, as occasion serves, which is a blessed imployment, *Psal.* 1. 1, 2. Would *Moses* deprive them of this happiness? Or was that Statute broken by the Jews every Sabbath day, as often as *Moses* was read in the Synagogues, in every City, as St. *James* tells us it was the Custome of old so to do? Mark then the Sophistry of this illiterate impostor, and his companions; I say, Illiterate, because he says, that passage of *Moses*, and the story of *Esdras*, *Nehem.* 8. 12, 13. was all, *We* (that is, Papists) read in Scripture of the common Peoples knowing the written word. Blessed be God that We Protestants may and do read more, that assures us, that the word of God did dwell plentifully among the Jews, and ought to do so with all Christians, without Bushels set over the Light, as in the Church of Rome. Yet we do not affirm, that every *Idiota*, or private servant of God could by his private study attain to the full meaning of every hard sentence. None of us thinks this necessary, or possible. Yea, we make a question at least, whether any High Priest, or Council, under the Old or New Testament ever fully understood all the things hard to be understood, or hard to be interpreted in the Law, and Prophets, or in the* Evangelical and Apostolical

Act. 15. 21.

* τὰ δυσερμήνευτα, 2. Pet. 1. 16.

τὰ δυσερμήνευτα, Heb. 5. 11.

lical writings. It is enough (as to my purpose, and indeed for the safety of Gods people) that the Faith and Duty of every one was written with a sufficient beam, and lay open to be read and understood by the common people with the help of a good Guide, though he were below Infallibility. And it was a grievous fault in the despisers of the riches of Gods Grace, that God had written for them the great things of his Law, and they were counted as a strang thing. This Queriſt doth bewray his ignorance by another miſtake, or ſome conſequence in his deſign to make the *Levites* and People dependent on the High Prieſt for the ſenſe of Scripture. He ſays, *Eſdras* the chief Prieſt interpreted the Law to the *Levites*, and enabled them to expound it to the people. Indeed *Ezrah* was a Prieſt, and a perfect Scribe, by whoſe induſtry and Gods ſpecial aſſiſtance the Books of *Moſes*, the *Pſalmes*, and *Prophets* were collected into one body of Oracles, which was in truſt committed to the cuſtody of the Jews. But not *Ezrah*, but *Jehoſhuah* was then High Prieſt, who no doubt was diligent in the diſcharge of his ſacred office, whiles *Ezrah* was active in interpreting, that is, tranſlating the Law written in the Hebrew Language, which was well-nigh loſt with the vulgar in their long captivity, who were accuſtomed to the common ſpeech of the Chaldeans their Lords, and rendring it intelligible in their familiar tongue, and alſo in expounding and applying the Law to their preſent uſe, and in aſſiſting the *Levites*, that they might be well inſtructed to perform their office of teaching the people. Now this work of *Ezrah* did much help, but not hinder or obſtruct the common people in their private ſtudy of the Law, and the uſe of their own particular judgment was fairly conſiſtent with the attendance on the publick Miniſtery, which was then ſincere and uncorrupted, but was not ſo throughout the whole courſe of the Jewiſh Politie. And for this reaſon nothing can be concluded from *Ezrah*'s age and actions to ſtrengthen the pretended Infallibility of the Jewiſh Prieſthood for ever.

Hoſ. 8. 12.

Rom. 3. 2.

Now

Now the Jews indeed wanted the beneficial Art of Printing, and this defect made the Copies of the Law leſs frequent, then the Bible is now adayes. Yet ſuch was the zeal and diligence of pious men in that Nation, that the Law was not ſo rare a thing, as this man would perſwade you. There was then no prohibition of the High Prieſt or Sanhedrim either to tranſcribe, or to tranſlate the Law and Prophets, or to read them in their Original, or tranſlated, no not in our Saviours Age, when he ſent his Auditors to the Scriptures, to ſearch for teſtimonies of him; when indeed it had been in vain for the people to have made their recourſe to the Scribes, Phariſees, Prieſts and Elders, who through ignorance of the Scriptures denied Jeſus to be the Chriſt, and out of malice excommunicated all thoſe that underſtood the Scriptures better then themſelves, and by their light were led to own Jeſus to be the Glory of *Iſrael*. I hope you will apprehend this to be ſufficient to vindicate your title to the Scripture, and your power to uſe it according to that judgement of diſcretion, which every Chriſtian, that ſtands bound to give an account of his faith, cannot be denied, without uſurping a dominion over faith; the very ſuſpicion whereof, St. *Paul*, although he were truly infallible, yet did carefully decline. 2 Cor. 1. 24.

The Queriſt treads the beaten path of Papiſts in debaſing the holy Scripture, and diveſting it of the fitneſs and power to be a compleat Rule, and an effectual inſtrument of faith, that he may make room for a new Quack: of which impious way to diminiſh the credit of Gods Word, I leave you, or any ſober Chriſtian that loves and reverences that invaluable pledge of Gods love, to make a judgement without my further cenſure. But give me leave to propound briefly ſome remarks of this Diſcourſe.

[Firſt I obſerve, that he often joyns the Rule and Means of Faith together, and confounds them ſo, as if they were one and the ſame thing. But the diſtinction of theſe two is of great importance to the preventing, or to the ending of frivolous Diſputes. 1.

The

The Rule of Faith is that publick ſtandard of Chriſtian Religion, which includes things of belief and practice, both in the ſervice of God, and alſo in converſation with men. The adequate Rule of Faith for Chriſtians is the Word of God revealed by Chriſt, or the Goſpel which was firſt preached, and then written by the inſtinct of the ſame Spirit, (*Rom.* 10. 8. 1 *Pet.* 1. 25.) The Goſpel in this ſence doth include in it the whole Scripture of the Old Teſtament, the divine Authority whereof it affirms, and confirms by the harmony of both. This Rule is one and immoveable, and ſo entirely delivered by the Apoſtles, that it is uncapable of addition, and the attempt of addition or mutilation or any corruption makes the falſifier of this Rule liable to a dreadfull *Anathema* denounced by St. *Paul*, Gal. 1. 8, 9. Now becauſe the holy Scriptures in their fulneſs contain this Goſpel, therefore they are uſually called by the ancient Fathers both Greek and Latin, the ſtraight, unerring, unſwerving Rule of Faith, that can deceive none, and needs no correction. This Rule contains and like a Light holds forth the object of our Faith, and is not the leſs a Rule of Faith, becauſe this holy Scripture comprehends many other things of great uſe for our inſtruction and ſpiritual delight; as a Carpenters Rule juſtly carries that name, and ſerves the turn of meaſuring ſtuff and work, though it be ſet out with ornamental and uſeful Tables.

Tertul. l. de Cornd. virgin. ſpeaking concerning the Creed; *Regula fidei una omnino eſt, ſola immobilis, & irreformabilis.*

You may now apprehend what we mean by the Rule of Faith. But the Means of Faith ſignifie another thing. For whatſoever by its nature and efficacy doth ſerve to bring man to the knowledge, right underſtanding, and full aſſurance of the ſaving Truth, comes under this Notion, the Means of Faith. The holy Scripture as it conveys unto us the Goſpel, which it contains and preſerves, is indeed a principal inſtrument of God to work that faith which is his gift. Moreover God hath in his wiſe government of the World and his Church appointed many means, which according to the courſe of his providence contribute

bute to the working of faith in our hearts. There are ſome outward, whereof the chief is the publick Miniſtry, which is compared to a Candleſtick that holds forth the light to the houſhold of faith. And not only Paſtors are the means of faith, but alſo Parents, and Maſters of Families, and every good Chriſtian, which is, as Chriſt ſays of his Diſciples in general, (for the twelve Apoſtles were not then ſelected out of the multitude) the light and ſalt of the earth, by communicating the Word unto others, are very often the happy propagators of the faith. Beſides men, ſome things, as Books, are inſtrumental to promote our knowledge and faith. There are ſome inward means of faith, as our ſenſe and rational faculties, in the exerciſe whereof if there be not an actual certainty allowed, the whole frame of civil ſociety will be diſſolved into confuſion, and the foundation of Religion will ſink, ſince faith is a reaſonable ſervice, and was firſt built upon their ſight which were eye-witneſſes of the Goſpel, and now comes by hearing, (*Rom.* 10. 17.) which two ſenſes are the inſtruments of Diſcipline. Neither will I exclude Oral or Practical Tradition from being a means to propagate the faith. But this is ſo ſlippery a way, ſo changeable, uncertain, and liable to corruption, and forgery, as appears by the ſuperſtitions of Heathens and Jews, for the divine Authority of all which Tradition was pretended, that without Scripture to ſupport it Tradition is too weak to hold up faith. Thus it appears that the Rule of faith can be but one, and it muſt be common to all, as the * faith and ſalvation are common, and it muſt have the unmoveable certainty of a Rock for man to build on. And this firmneſs you may call, if you pleaſe, Infallibility, for this property of God, who is ἀψευδὴς, (*Tit.* 1. 2. *Heb.* 5. 18.) can neither be deceived, nor deceive, is communicated to his Word, which is the Truth it ſelf, and therefore the Rule of faith. But the term, Infallible, is a Scholaſtical Novelty, which neither Scripture, nor the ancient Fathers uſed to attribute unto the Church; but now

Mat. 5. 13, 14.

Luk. 1. 2. Act. 4. 20. 1 Joh. 1. 1.

* Tit. 1. 3. Jud. v. 3.

now it makes such a noise in the world with the incessant ringing of Papists, that it stupifies many mens senses and understandings. But the Means of faith are manifold, which, where God himself by his Spirit manages them, are effectual to beget a saving faith, though many of them are far short of Infallibility, though Papists in their confused way of talking require Infallibility in the Ground, Rule, and Means of Faith equally.]

2. Again, Pray note his unprosperous fraud in the abatement of the Scriptures perfection and all sufficiency to teach us the whole mystery of godliness, without setting us to seek out elsewhere for a remnant of faith, or an unwritten Word. For he confesses the Scriptures to be a profitable, but a partial Rule, which contains many of the most important points of Religion clearly and expressly enough, to satisfie any capacity, but wilful pertinacy; and for the rest which are not thus expressed, it refers us to the Church, and the Governors thereof, *&c.* For certain the Monarchy of the Pope, and the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*, are the fundamental stones of the Romish Religion, and if they could be proved true, are of the most importance to the ease of conscience and the peace of Christendom in that sluggish and servile way, wherein Papists would lead us: and therefore it is no wonder that Papists who are true to their interest, contend earnestly for these that are such points, as being once admitted they facilitate the reception of all other Doctrines whatsoever. Now let the Papists shew these two clearly expressed in Scripture, or shew us a good reason why the Apostle should have a greater mind to tell the after-Ages of the Church of his Cloak and Parchments, then to inform them of those points which according to their opinion are necessary to preserve the Church in peace, especially then and there when St. *Paul* had it in his design to recount all the grounds, motives, and means of Christians keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and yet hath left out the Headship of the Pope, and the Magistery of

Read Eph. 4. 3. to 14.

the

the Infallible Guide, the Roman Church. What reaſon imaginable can be given, why Chriſt and his Apoſtles ſhould not have an equal kindneſs for all the important points of Religion, and an equal care to conſerve their memory by writing? or indeed what need was there of writing any thing at all of particular points, when one Reference of us to the Church for all, would have ſerved the turn? would not one precept written of, Ask the Church, that is the governors of it; or, inſtead of Search the Scriptures, Inquire for the univerſal Tradition of Chriſtendome, have been convenient and ſufficient for our ſatisfaction in all points as well as in ſome? Ah, how palpable is the folly of vain and proud man, when he oppoſes the wiſdom of God? But when I ſeriouſly conſider what this man writes of the Scriptures referring us for the reſt of our Faith to the Church, or univerſal Tradition, I cannot but wonder at his confidence of your credulity, if you were bound to take his word; who offers no proof of what he affirms.

But we ſhall juſtly conclude him to bely the Scripture, till he or ſome body for him produce ſome place of Scripture, which expreſſely referrs us for ſome important points of Religion unwritten to the oral teaching of the Church, or to the univerſal Tradition of Chriſtendom. If this Queriſt be asked the Queſtion, Where hath Scripture made the partition of the Faith into the Word of God written, and the word unwritten, and ſet up a Chriſtian to ſtand (as the Angel in St. *John*'s viſion) ſtood with the right foot on the Sea, and the left foot on the land) with one foot on the unſtable waters of Tradition, and the other fixed on the firm ground of Scripture, he muſt be as mute as the man without the wedding garment was. Apoc. 10. 10.

But after all this pray obſerve, how irreconcileable this mans allowance of Scripture to be a Rule clear enough for many weighty points of Religion, is with

his Concluſion, That the ſole Rule general for all perſons and all points of Religion is univerſal Tradition.

3. Whereas he ſpends time to oppoſe a Chriſtians receiving and knowing what he is to believe, what not, by his ſole peruſal of Gods written word, he fights not againſt any aſſertion of ours, but againſt his own *Jack ſtraw*: we adviſe Chriſtians to make uſe of faithful guides as well as the light, and to learn the uſe of the Rule by conferring with ſpiritual builders, that can inform them in the application of it, and not to neglect any meanes which God offers them for their conduct in the way of truth.

4. The common Objections againſt the dignity and efficacy of Scripture, which Papiſts repeat, *uſque ad nauſeam*, to the Scandal of Chriſtianity, and the advancement of Atheiſm, are abundantly anſwered by the Champians of our Religion; to which I would refer you, if I did not know you able to diſcover their impertinency and impiety together. But I will put you in mind, that the unlearned Proteſtants, if they depend upon the credit of others, what are the words of Scripture, (when the Laick that cannot read hears the Miniſter that doth, and may ask his neighbour that can read whether the Miniſter read right, and the ignorant may ask the learned, and the weak Chriſtian may ask the ſtrong, and all men by ſome means or other may be ſatisfyed of the words of Scripture being faithfully delivered unto them) are in no worſe condition, then unlearned Papiſts, who depend upon the credit of ſurly (and very often ſilly) Prieſts, or intereſted Biſhops, for knowing what is the univerſal Tradition of Chriſtendome.

5. As to the learned, whom the Queriſt takes into conſideration, I pray obſerve, whether the Scholars of both the oppoſite ſides do not diſſent as much about the univerſal Tradition of the points in diſpute, as about the ſenſe of Scriptures urged on either ſide. If ſo (as you will

will be ſure to find it) then upon the ſame ground which this man layes as ſufficient for the removal of Scripture from being a rule, Tradition alſo muſt be caſhiered. Remember that the learned Papiſts who differ about the Conception of the bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, do on either ſide urge for their defence univerſal Tradition.

If then it be not ſufficient to determine this controverſie, why ſhould it be ſet up to juſtle Scripture out of its Seat to make room for another means of determining controverſies, which is as uneffectual, and indeed infinitely more unfit? If a Papiſt ſay, that the determination of this point is not neceſſary, (which is a groſs abſurdity, becauſe this remaining undetermined no ſmall part of Popiſh worſhip of the Virgin *Mary*, as the Feaſt of the Immaculate Conception, hath no certain ground of Faith, and by the Apoſtle St. *Paul*'s ſentence is Sin) we may with more reaſon ſay, that the determination of the points in controverſie between us is not neceſſary: Or if it be neceſſary, that determination is to be regulated now, as the deciſion of things in diſpute was of old in the general Councils, by the Scripture, or written word of God, by which Tradition it ſelf is to be meaſured and judged, as St. *Paul* made the Scriptures the κανὼν, or meaſure of truth between * the Tradition of the Jews on the one ſide, and the Chriſtians on the other ſide concerning the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt. Rom. 14 23. * Mat. 26. 15. Read 1. Cor. 15. 3, 4. 6.

[Becauſe here is frequent mention of Tradition, and the ambiguity of the word is apt to beget miſtakes, and confuſion therefore give me leave to unfold the Senſes of the word, that we may have a clear apprehenſion of the matter in hand. Tradition is ſometimes put to ſignify the thing delivered, whether the way of delivery be writing or ſpeaking, and Tradition thus taken materially is indifferent to the being written, or unwritten: for the ſame Tradition, or Doctrine of the Goſpel which was at one time unwritten, might have been written, and for certain was at another time writ-

And the Jewiſh Traditions, which for many generations paſt by a ſucceſſive conveyance without Book, have been by the *Rabbies* committed at length to vvriting for their better Security. And the Papiſts now make no ſcruple of vvriting their Traditions, vvhich they call the unvvritten Word of God; (let them juſtify the preſumption as vvell as they can). Novv as the Traditions of the Elders mentioned in Scripture ſignify the doctrines and Ceremonies, that vvere delivered by the Fathers; but vvere diſtinct from the Law vvritten: So when vve ſpeak of Traditions in the Chriſtian Church; vve do now in theſe latter ages commonly underſtand ſome particular doctrines or Rites or matters of fact delivered with a pretence of divine or at leaſt Apoſtolical Authority for their reception, which are not expreſſed in the written word of God.

Mat. 14. 2, 3, 6.

Theſe Traditions once accepted and commended by the preſent Church of *Rome* the Conventicle at *Trent*, hath very ſeverely enjoyned to be received and embraced with an equal affection of holy reverence, wherewith we entertayn the ſacred Scriptures themſelves. But to keep up the myſtery of iniquity with the liberty of laying aſide old Traditions, and giving credit to new inventions; as their intereſt and occaſions may require, they who determined the Canon of Scriptures, and numbred the Books; yet would not reckon up and determine the Traditions of the Church, that Chriſtians might know what is the perfect and fixed Rule of Faith.

Thus Romaniſts, though they have a larger Object of Faith, then we have, yet they have no certain meaſure; becauſe the Traditions of the Roman Church are like the Moon ſubject to decreaſes, (as the giving of the Euchariſt to Infants was once held by D. *Innocentius* 3. as a Doctrine of Faith, and a Tradition of the Church; but after 600 years practiſe wore out inſenſibly, and hath been condemned by the Councils of *Conſtance*, and *Trent* with an *Anathema*) and to increaſes alſo, and therefore their Religion

Maldonate on John 6. confeſſeth thus much.

Religion is indeed Irregular. But concerning Traditions as the word ſignifies particular points of beliefe or practiſe in Chriſtian Religion, theſe 3 Rules are worth Obſervation.

1. Whatſoever is offered to us or enjoyned to us in belief or practiſe under colour of being a Tradition, if it be repugnant to the written word of God, or deſtructive of Gods precepts, ought to be rejected by Chriſtians. Chriſts reaſon together with the refutation of Phariſaical Traditions confirms the Truth of this Rule.

Nihil credit Deus voluit, adverſus Se ipſarum authoritatem. Aug. l. 13. cont. Fauſt. Manich. Mark 7. 5,-13.

2. Whatſoever is obtruded upon us under the pretext of being a Tradition, that is neither clearly delivered in, nor fairly by good conſequence deduced out of Gods written word, needs not, and ought not to be received as a matter neceſſary to Salvation. The manner of conveniency, or neceſſity, wherein things which are ſtrangers to Scripture are held, is carefully to be taken notice of. For ſeveral practiſes have been in early times introduced under ſhew of conveniency (as the Apoſtle ſays, ſome bodily exerciſes carry a plauſible ſhew of wiſdome) which having once obtained credit by the favourable commendation of eminent perſons and cuſtome, have been in ſucceſſion of time adorned with the Title of Tradition and grown up from being thought convenient to be accounted and preſt as neceſſary to Salvation. This danger is to be prevented by circumſpection. And the perfection of Scripture as it is a compleat Rule of Religion proves the truth aud uſefulneſs of this ſecond Rule.

3. Doctrines of Faith and divine Worſhip being ſecured by Gods written word from intruſions of humane inventions: if any Rites or Ceremonies can be proved by fair Teſtimonies of Antiquity to have been practiſed by the Church univerſal of primitive times, and are ſtill continued by the Authority of Church Governors as tending to edification, or the free and open profeſſion of our Faith, whether they be called Traditions or no, are not lightly to be rejected; much leſs violently oppoſed by private Chriſtians,

ſtians. Thus much for Traditions, as meaning Matters of Religion delivered down from former times to poſterity.

But Tradition often bears another ſence, and is taken formally for the manner of conveyance of matters that concern Religion, which is partly oral partly practical. The joynt agreement of Doctrine and practice continued by ſucceſſion of one Age after another, whilſt one generation derives to another the whole body of Religion, is now called Tradition, and of late is aſſerted by Papiſts in this Kingdom to be the only Principle and Rule of Faith, and affirmed to be of its own nature infallible and incorruptible, and to be evident by its own light. And thus the order of inquiring for the ancient dayes and old wayes is quite inverted: for now we need only (as they teach) mark what the preſent Church of *Rome* doth, and becauſe Tradition cannot fail nor vary, therefore the Popes Court at this day, with the Church, Altars, Pictures, Wafers, mangled Euchariſt, adoration of the Virgin *Mary*, Invocation of Angels and Saints, offering of a real Sacrifice for Souls in Purgatory, and offering of the Maſſe to God for the honour of Saints, is a true Glaſſe, wherein you may ſee the face of the Church when St. *Peter* ſate Biſhop of *Rome*. This is the aim of the Queriſts Diſcourſe to ſet up this Tradition inſtead of Scripture. If you will not believe him, you may chooſe, becauſe he tels you plainly it is not his work to prove any thing. But I will give you a little touch of proving the vanity of this pretence. The experience of all Ages before the flood, after the flood, in the Jewiſh Nation, and in the Chriſtian Churches, doth manifeſtly ſhew, that the derivation of Religion from mouth to ear, from hand to hand, from Fathers to children, from Prieſts to Succeſſors, from Age to Age, this courſe of Tradition, which is oppoſed unto and preferred before the Scriptural way of preſerving and propagating and recovering of Religion, hath been and may be quickly corrupted, often interrupted, and hath ſuffered notorious changes, and may do at any time, when ſloth, and ſenſuality,

and

and neglect of the light, and vanity of mind set forward by the Devils malice and cunning make men weary of the true Religion. But I will add another Argument to another purpose. St. *Paul* by word of mouth taught the *Thessalonians* what he thought not expedient to write, to wit, what hindered the Man of sin from being revealed. Here was a matter of consequence that concerned the Church delivered by word of mouth, which if it had been written as well as that Character of the Man of sin, the same Scripture, which preserved and conveyed the one, would have also secured the knowledge of the other to posterity. If now an eminent Church failed in deriving one point of Doctrine to after-Ages, which with little difficulty might have been kept and taught, but is now lost for not being recorded in Scripture, what likelihood is there, that the whole body of Christian Religion was, or could be traduced entire and pure meerly by oral Tradition, without dependance on the Scripture, for 1600 years? For my part I think still, that as the Church of the Jews were either more or less pure, and their Religion more or less flourished in truth and sincerity, as the Governors gave heed more or less to the light of the Law written; in like manner according to the degrees of Pastors attendance to the holy Scriptures the Tradition of Christianity hath varied. Therefore the Scriptures are the only fixed and stable Rule of Religion.] 2 Thes. 2. 7.

Lastly, Let us allow the Rule of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, *Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus, non est erratum, sed traditum*; That which hath been taught every where, always, and by all Pastors of the Church, is not an error, but a true Tradition. If we make Antiquity, Universality, and Consent, twisted together, the measure of our faith, for certain we shall have a very short Creed, and that large *Assumentum*, that new piece of Italian stuff which was woven in the Shop at *Trent*, and by the Popes stitching is added to the old garment of the Church (the *Constantinopolitan* Creed) must of necessity be pared off, and thrown away. But the main thing to be considered at present, is the difficulty of applying this

this Rule, for the examination of the Doctrines which pre-
1 Joh. 4. 1. 2 Thes. 5. 21. tend to Tradition; and the tryal of the Spirits, even of all Doctrines, before we truſt any Teacher, is alwayes an act of Chriſtian prudence, ſo long as the world is peſtered with falſe Prophets. For can you, or any reaſonable man imagin, that Univerſal Tradition of the Catholick Church is more evident in it ſelf, and more conſpicuous to learned and unlearned, and eaſier to be applied by particular Chriſtians, then the Scripture, the ſtudy whereof for the diſcovery of ſo much as is neceſſary to be believed and done, requires infinitely leſs pains, then is requiſite for the certain knowledge of what the Church in all ages and places hath taught as matter of faith neceſſary to ſalvation? You Sir are pretty well verſed in Books, and have been inquiſitive into Antiquity, and I believe you will conclude it much eaſier, to know the mind and will of God, (which is the meaſure of
Rom. 12, 2 Eph. 5. 10, 17. ſpiritual wiſdom, and the *Unum neceſſarium*, the One thing neceſſary for us to ſeek after) then to learn the ſence of the Church, that is, ſtill according to the Queriſts Expoſition, of the chief Paſtors in all Ages, concerning the points in debate between us. To cloſe up this Diſcourſe, try whether you find not within your ſelf enough of reaſon to conſent to this reſolution; he that by attendance on Gods Ordinances diſpenſed by a faithful Miniſtry and by private ſtudy of Gods Book hath learned the Goſpel of Chriſt, and is a good practical Scholar of the ſaving Grace of God which hath appeared unto all men (a Catholick Light, common as
Tit. 2. 11, 12. the Sun) *teaching us, that denying ungodlineſs and worldly luſts we live ſoberly, righteouſly, and religiouſly in this preſent world*,
Θεοδίδακτος. this man (I ſay) being* taught of God, doth know *à priori*,
Joh. 6. 45. before-hand, and by the very ſeed, and in the firſt principle, what the true Church Catholick holds. For that Word of God which lives and abides for ever in Heaven (*Pſal.* 119. 8,9.) in the hearts of believers, (2 *Cor.* 3. 3. 1 *Joh.* 3. 9.) in
1 Pet. 1. 23,25. the Scriptures, and in the Church, is that incorruptible ſeed by which the Church Catholick is begotten, and by which it lives. Since then the Church is no longer, or fur-

ther

ther a Church then as it believes the Goſpel, and the faithful Paſtors in all ages do teach that Goſpel, it muſt needs be, that whoſoever knows the Goſpel, knows what is the ſenſe of the Catholick Church, though he never ſpend an hour in the reading of hiſtory, whereas if he ſpend *Methuſalahs* age in tumbling over the Fathers, Schoolmens Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories and other Volumes, he may weary his fleſh, and yet not know by them what was the Faith of the Catholick Church.

Now to the mans concluſion; He acknowledges that a direct fit and true anſwer to my Queries (*mutatis mutandis*) would be an anſwer to his captious queſtions, which he propounds with the ſame mind, as his admired Maſters the Scribes and Phariſees did trouble our Saviour Chriſt with Interrogatories, thinking (but in vain) that we ſhould be intangled in our own Anſwers, whereas indeed he had been catched, if he had given appoſite Anſwers. But after mine examination which I reſign up to your diſcretion, I deſire you to transform your ſelf by the power of imagination for a while into the perſon of a well-minded Jew, that ſeeks for ſatisfaction in Religion in a diſtracted eſtate of the Church, and try whether this Queriſt being forced to turn Reſpondent hath fully and fitly anſwered my Counter-Queries.

My next Task is to examine his exceptions againſt my Categorical Anſwers. I ſhall not contend about words, nor much crave excuſe for want of accurate expreſſion in that haſty delivery of my Conceptions to comply with your requeſt at that time.

As to the firſt, he excepts againſt the term *Chriſtianity*, 1.
as dubious to make my Anſwer acceptable, I will inſert the Term he deſires, and ſay, *True Chriſtianity*. But I fear the addition will diſpel no miſt of doubtfulneſs, if there were any ſuch about the anſwer. For Hereticks alwaies pretend to Truth as much as to Chriſtianity; and would be taken for the only true Chriſtians. But to ſatisfy his nice and curious palate I anſwer as fully as he deſires.

There was, is, and shall be till the worlds end, a Catholick Church, that in every age is visible by profession of true Christianity to the persons then living. That is to say, In all ages God had, and will have and preserve some Christians, who shall so profess the Truth according to the doctrine of the Gospel, that their light of Faith shall shine to the men of their generation respectively.

But I cannot so easily admit another addition slicly made by the Querist to my Answer, *viz.* *in their whole profession.* ——— *Lacet auguis in herbâ.* He that professes true Christianity may build hay and stubble upon the foundation, and yet not miscarry in his person, whilst he holds fast his profession of the saving truth unto the end, though he be saved through the fire, and loose his superstructure, as St. *Paul* assures us. It is not therefore necessary that any person, or Church which maintains true Christianity, should profess it in such an absolute purity, as that water should never be mixed with the wine. It is enough, that poyson is not admixed with the liquor of life.

1 Cor. 3. 12, 13.

But because I perceive, that there is much ambiguity in the termes of the Query, for which it deserves to be called *Fallacia plurium interrogationum*, a sophistical trick of asking many things under one word, that hath two faces under a hood, I will weigh the words over again, and mould my answer anew, fitted to his explication of the word *Catholick*. In common speech *Catholick* is no more than Universal: *Justin Martyr*, who with many others of that age believed a particular Resurrection of some that should rise and reign 1000 years, before the end of the World calls the last Resurrection τὴν καθολικὴν ἀνάστασιν, the Catholick or in plain English Universal Resurrection. There is also a Catholick Faith, which is common to all Christians and comprises all that is necessary to Salvation. And the Church of Christ now unconfined to any one place or nation, but spreading like a fruitful vine her branches throughout the earth is called *Catholick* that is not National; as the old Church of the Jews was, but Universal, since

Justi. Mart. dial. cum Tryph.

ſince the Goſpel is preached to all the vvorld indifferently, and the voice of the Apoſtles vvent forth into all the earth, and their vvords unto the ends of the habitable vvorld. It is not to be omitted that in a ſecondary and borrovved ſenſe the word *Catholick* is applied to them that hold the true Faith which is common to all Chriſtians and therefore Catholick. In this ſenſe not only a particular Church, but alſo a ſingular perſon may be called Catholick, meaning one that profeſſes the Catholick Faith. But the Querift who hath a peculiar language, and though he ſpeaks Engliſh, yet means Italian, hath taught me ſince I firſt read his Queſtions, and anſwered them according to the common uſage of the words, that he meant by the Catholick Church the Repreſentative Church in a full and lawful meeting of the Prieſts and Paſtors to teach the Church diffuſive. Now according to this ſenſe of the words, *Catholick Church*, I do turn my Affirmative Anſwer into a Negative, and ſay; There is not in all ages a viſible Catholick Church, meaning a general Council lawfully aſſembled. If this be Equivocation, you ſee who teac hes me to be double tongued. Col. 2. 6. Rom. 10. 18.

The exception againſt my ſecond Anſwer is, that I add the word, ordinarily, and he ſuppoſes that I might mean, that ſome may be ſaved in extraordinary caſes out of the viſible Church, and therefore he takes my Anſwer to be Affirmative; That ſome may be ſaved out of the Catholick Church, and this he thinks is contrary to the ſtream of Antiquity. If he had not had the malignant diſpoſition rather then the quick-ſighted eye of a Serpent, he would never have eſpied a fault in my Anſwer, and fancied an Affirmative ſentence in a Negative Propoſition. For if he had not been forward to cavil, he might have eaſily conceived a very obvious reaſon of my putting in the word *Ordinarily*. Becauſe we know not how God will deal in judging all out of the pale of the Church, and we that live within it are concerned to give an account onely for our ſelves, and for the uſe of our Light and Talent, I ſaid that, Ordinarily out *Mage cernit acutum, quam aut Aquila, aut Serpens Epidaurius.* Horat.

of the Catholick Church there is no Salvation. This negative, which resolves nothing positively concerning Gods extraordinary acting, cannot without unjust violence to my words be taken for an affirmative sentence, That some may be saved out of the Church. And I hope, you will excuse, if not justify, my unwillingness to limit the spirit and mercies of God, which blows and shine where God pleases. As for Christian Antiquity, you know that many antient Doctors have been very favourable in their judgment, not only of them who lived by the law of nature in a communion with God, when the Covenant of Grace was first ratified with the Hebrew Patriarchs, though those worshippers of God were not of the stock of *Israel*; but also of them who lived in latter ages in the acknowledgment of one God with a constant observation of Truth and Justice, such as were *Socrates* and *Aristides*.

Of this see *Is. Casaub. Exerc.* 1. *ad Card. Baron. Appar.* 1.

But according to the Querists explication of the Church Catholick, I shall now change the shape of my second Answer also, and say, That Christians may attain salvation out of a Representative Church, which he gives to be the meaning of a Catholick Church in the Querie, and charges me with sophistry because I will not understand it so. The members of a general Council being but few, (and that not agreed, who have right to be so) it were hard with Christendom, if all who are *extra Concilium*, out of that compass, were excluded out of Heaven. I add, that the Church Catholick may stand, and all the members of it may be saved without a Church-Representative.

Now because all that he says is but beating the Air, and very impertinent to his design of making a Convert, (which is the thing aimed at) I add a Proposition, which though it be not a direct Answer to his Question, yet it shall strangle or stifle his intended Conclusion in the conception, and it is this;

A Man may be a member of Christs body (which we now call the Catholick Church) and be in the Ark, out of which there is no Salvation, though he be not in communion with the chief

chief Governors of the Roman Synagogue. Let him deny this, if he dare make an open forfeiture of his charity: Let him disproveit, if he can. There was a visible Church, and Salvation attained in it, before there was a stone laid at *Rome* of a spiritual Temple, (for *Jerusalem* was the mother and Mistress of all Churches, and not *Rome*, as the Father of lies teaches Papists to say and swear) and it may be so again, when *Babylon* the great, the City seated on seven hills is fallen as a millstone cast into the bottom of the Sea. In the mean time, the old position of Dr. *Jo. Reynolds* is worthy of Remembrance, The Roman Church is neither the Catholick Church, nor a sound member of the Catholick Church.

Read the Bul. of P. *Pius* 4. which enjoyns all Clergymen, and all in Religious Orders to swear to the new Creed whereof this is one Article. I acknowledge the Holy Catholick and Apostolick Roman Church the Mother and Mistress of all Churches.

My Answer to his third Querie is very magisterially, but ridiculously censured by him to have nothing of a Categorical Answer. The Proposition is for certain Categorical, because it is not hypothetical: Let the Question and the Return be compared, and this will appear defective in nothing necessary to an Answer. The demand is this,

I desire to know by designation, which, amongst them all which pretend to be the Catholick Church or a part of it, is now the Catholick Church.

The Answer runs thus; That is the Holy Catholick Church which professeth that one Holy Catholik Faith, once for all delivered to the Saints, *&c. ut supra.*

He says, I give no designation of any particular profession or professions of Christians: That is to say, (if I mistake not his meaning) I do not name Protestants, or Papists, the Church of *England*, or of *Rome*, or of *Greece*, or of *Germany*. Indeed if I had so done, I had then given an Answer, that could not satisfie any rational man. For no Church denominated from the place of habitation, (which way of distinction of Churches is usual in Scripture) or from some bond of union, which is not general to all Christendom, can properly and truly be called the Catholick, that is the Universal Church. But I that was at liberty to design it as well as I could, did give a significant Character of the Catholick

Church

Church taken from its proper office and action. The Querist says, I tell what the holy Catholick Church is. Very good. But I do not design which of so many several professions in the world is now the Catholick Church. Now if he expect that I should play the fool, and say that a particular Church is properly the Catholick Church, I hope you will not be offended if I do not satisfie his expectation. And when I have designed the Church Universal so, that a man may understand what it is, I think with the same labour I have told him which is it, because the Church Universal is but one, as he that tels what the Sun is, designs which is the Sun, because there are not many Suns. And because the Church is a collective body, that is, one by aggregation of similar parts, each of which lesser Societies is called a Church, I have given him a Mark whereby he may know, whether any particular Society be a member of that Body, since the one faith runs through the one body, and is the life of that body and of every limb of it. But my fault is, that I design one obscure thing by another that is equally obscure. I will mend my fault, if I do not justifie my self from having committed one. I confess all spiritual things are obscure to men that are meerly carnal or natural, but where the Gospel shines, if it be attended unto, it brings light with it, whereby we may discern things that differ. For judging or discerning of a true Church from a false, we must first know in some measure what is Truth. For if we must discern a good tree from a bad by the fruit, as our Saviour directs us to do, then we must first know what is good, and bad in fruit, and then consider what fruit the tree bears, and from thence give a judgement of the tree. This is the method, which we must take in the enquiring for a true Church. Till we know what is Truth, (and that is * the Faith once delivered to the Saints) we cannot know what Church brings forth good or bad fruit. Profession of faith is bearing of fruit. The goodness of this fruit is Truth, that is, agreeableness to the Word of God. It is therefore necessary that we know the Truth, before we can know a Church

Mat. 7. 16, 17, 18.

* Thy (*scil.* Gods) Law is the Truth, Psal. 119. 142. Gods Word is the Truth, Joh. 17. 17

to

to be true. Now though the Truth, or the holy Catholick Faith may be under doubt, and debate, yet hath God set it up in the Scriptures so conspicuously, that if the Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that perish. Therefore I added to the Character of the Church by which I designed it to be known, that is, the profession of faith, the means whereby we may know what the faith is, which being professed is the sole certain mark of a true Church. For the marks of the Church which Romanists commonly give are separable from the Truth, and if they be taken singly without truth are false and treacherous *indices*, whereas the true faith of it self is a sure note of a true Church. And I pointed at Scripture, which is the Rule of faith, on purpose in mine Answer, that I might not be thought to send a man to look for a thing in the dark without a light. And now Sir do you judge, whether I have deserved blame by my designation of the Catholick Church by professing the Catholick Faith. But to make mine Answer both applicable to the Question, and also useful to you, I shall a little explicate and enlarge my sence. It is presumed, that the enquiry after a Church is made by a Christian, that may be distracted in the variety of visible Societies differing one from another, but every one equally pretending to be a Church, but his distraction is the greater, because of all Societies, only the Roman Synagogue doth challenge to her self to be the Ark, out of which there is no salvation. There are three Reasons which may move Christians to enquire for a Church, or a visible Society of Christians: 1. That they may serve God, and offer up the spiritual sacrifices of praise and prayer by Christ Jesus. 2. That they may grow in grace and the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. 3. That they may joyn with Gods people, and keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace by communicating together in Gods holy Ordinances. To compass these ends a Christian is not concerned to enquire where the Catholick Church is, for it is confessedly diffused through the Nations, but so spread by Gods dispensation of the light, that the Sun of righteousness doth

2 Cor. 4. 3.

Heb. 13. 15.
1 Pet. 2. 5.
2 Pet. 3. 18

not

not at one time arise to all parts of the world. Besides, the Candlestick is moveable from any place, and the Kingdom of God may be transferred from one Nation to another, neither hath God by any the least indication of his will and pleasure encouraged any portion of mankind, or part of the world, to promise to themselves a perpetual establishment of the Church in that place and in that successive body of men, which at some time hath been, or is now irradiated with the Gospel. It is therefore not at all material to trouble our selves with delineations of the Catholick Church which hath no set or certain limits of extent. That which concerns us to know, is what Church pretending to be a member of the Church Universal (for no men but Papists, that can admit contradictions into their Creed, will speak such non-sense, with deliberation, as that is, when they call a particular society of Christians combined under one Bishop the Universal Church) is fit and safe to be communicated withal, that we must reap the benefits of a Christian Congregation. Therefore the Question is now, whether the Church, wherein I was born and baptized, and by Gods Providence am seated under its government, or another different society of Christians which invite me to their communion, be such a company as I may safely joyn with them in all publick offices of Religion. For if it be, I am bound to communicate with that Church as being a member of the Body of Christ, the unity of which Body I am bound to maintain.

Apoc. 2. 5.

The Truth therefore of the doctrine taught, the integrity and purity of the divine worship celebrated, and the way of administring Ecclesiastical power must be examined by some Rule, and known to be agreeable to the Gospel of Christ, before a Christians conscience can be satisfied of the necessity of communion with that Church upon this account, because it is a member of a Church Catholick. Since then it is the custome to call any publick society of Christians, that are compacted together by a frame of political government into one body, a Church, that

particular

particular Church is a member of the Catholick, which holds that Faith, the profeſſion whereof conſtitutes the Church Catholick. He that ſleights this Deſignation, would have dealt kindly with us, if he had diſcovered unto us, a better way, or a clearer Light by which we might find the Church, and diſcover a true Church from a vain pertender. Till he or ſome other do that office for us, we think it beſt to ſeek for a Church, if we were now to ſeek, by looking for the light of truth in it, which alwaies ſhines in the houſe of God. And becauſe truth and peace are both the legacies of Chriſt bequeathed unto the Church, we may do well to try what ſociety of Chriſtians doth follow peace and edification of the Body of Chriſt. If the Church of *Rome* that ſets up Images of God, (which are the teachers of lies) in their Temples, and by her *Anathemaes* makes diviſions in Chriſtendome, be tryed by thoſe two marks; I leave the event to any one, that will impartially pronounce ſentence according to the evidence of fact in the whole bulk of their doctrines and Devotions, and in their publick Government.

My fourth Anſwer hath the ſame fate with the former, to be called not Categorical. I muſt learn new Logick, as well as new Theologie, to underſtand this *Gentleman*. But it is charged with defect, becauſe it reflects not upon the whole Queſtion, and takes no notice of the tail, wherein the ſting of the *Scorpion* lies. I confeſs mine Anſwer comes ſhort in that particular: becauſe I did not apprehend then, the laſt clauſe of his queſtion to be of any moment. For I thought it enough, that the Church Catholick is ſecured from any error that is deſtructive of Salvation. But becauſe I am now informed, that the main force of the Querie lies in this, *Whether the Holy Church ſo deſigned can teach any error as matter of Faith endangering of Salvation*; I now make a return to that part, as well as to the former; and indeed to the whole Queſtion.

1. Errors that endanger Salvation do not alwaies deſtroy it.

2. God hath promiſed to preſerve his Church from deſtruction, but not from danger.

3. All errors when they are discovered are to be rejected.

4. No doctrines offered by any Church to her Children are to be received without examination.

5. The Catholick Church as it signifies the whole Body of Christendome is too big to be a teacher, that may be consulted, and hearkened unto.

6. The Church in this mans sense and explication, that is, an Assembly of chief Pastors in Council may teach errors endangering Salvation. *Arianism* hath been taught in as large Assemblies of chief Pastors, as the true Faith hath been.

7. But because it is the design of this man, that we should take the Roman Church for the Catholick, I stick not to say that the Roman Church teaches her children errors that endanger the attaining of Salvation.

5. My first Answer is excepted against for the interposition of these words, [*So long as it continues so*] which looks like a condition, and seem to suppose that the Catholick Church can cease to be so. The words are capable of another construction, *viz.* The Holy Catholick Church so long as it continues secured from teaching destructive errors cannot even for that reason abuse the world with forged Scriptures. This was then my meaning, who had no intention that my last Answer should contradict my first.

Let us now see, what he draws from my Answer, if it were Categorical, and how rational his inference is. For now we are come to the bottom of his project. And he thinks he hath catched us so fast in his trap, that either we must give him the Cause, or be condemned but of our own mouths.

If mine Answer be, (says this new fashioned Logician) *that the Church can never shelude false Scriptures*, &c. *then you must grant that the Catholick visible Church is infallible in the delivery of Scripture. If so, then is there an infallible Judg upon the earth concerning this point.*

How rash this inference is, and how incoherent the conclusion with the premises, a few words will serve to discover. It is acknowledged on both sides, that the primitive Church, which received the Scriptures was not, and because Gods spi-

rit

rit guided and governed the Church in this important busi-
nefs, could not be abused and mistaken in the receiving of
Canonical Scripture. The Catholick Church being quickly
after enlarged, and spred through many regions of the earth
did together with the Gospel preached receive Copies of the
Scriptures, which had been communicated by the particular
Churches, to which they were directed at first, unto their
neighbour Churches. These Scriptures were by all Churches
reverenced and preserved as the Grand Charter of their Sal-
vation, and the Laws and Records of their Society; as the
Church was the Kingdome of Christ distinguished from the
world. The zeal of Christians for their Laws, and their know-
ledg of them, which were frequently read in the publick As-
semblies, according to an * Apostolical order, to which we Col. 14.
must add above all the Providence of Gods watching over the 16.
Church for the preservation of Scriptures, being more pre-
tious to God than to Man, and as pretious to God as the world
it self, these being well considered may assure us, that it was
morally impossible, that the whole Church of God should be
cousened into the reception of any forged Scriptures. And
if the Church in following ages could not combine together
to coyn counterfeit Scriptures, then the Church universal
could never obtrude any thing upon the world for Canonical
Scripture which was not received from the Primitive Church
at first. But how doth it follow from hence, that the Church
is an Infallible Judg in this point? A creditable witness is not
presently an Infallible Judg. A faithful Depositary that keeps
Records is not the same thing with an erring Judg. The
Tradition of the Church Universal, which hath derived the
Holy Scriptures from age to age, is not an Act of Judicature.
The Nation of the Jews is at this day a credible witness of the
divine Original and authority of the Old Testament, at least
at the first plantation of the Church Christian, the Jewish
Church did preserve and deliver the Holy Scriptures intire
(so much at least as God thought necessary or expedient, and
if any book were lost, that by being lost became unnecessary)
and was secured by Gods Providence in the conveyance of
his Oracles to Christians. Doth it hence follow that the

People of the Jews was a visible Infallible Judg in that point and if so, then in all matters of Faith? For thus the Papist proceeds.

If so, I require some satisfactory reason (says the Querist) why the Church should be infallible in this, and fallible in other points of Faith, &c.

I have already shewed that the Case is not so, as this man imagines; therefore I am not bound to give him the satisfaction which he requires. Yet for your further information, I add this: 1. The reception and tradition of Scriptures by the Church is a fact which God orders as expedient for the preservation of Religion. 2. The certain number of the Books written by inspiration is not a point of faith necessary for every Christian to know and believe unto Salvation. 3. The Catholick Church cannot err in any point of faith necessary to salvation. 4. But any particular Church may believe and teach erroneous Doctrine for matter of Faith. The Church of *Rome* (which is not the sole keeper of Scripture) may and doth err in several points of their Religion, and doth impose upon her children uncanonical Books for Scripture, and false Doctrines for matters of faith, as is evident by the Canons of the Conventicle of *Trent*. And yet it is not in the power of the Church of *Rome* to abuse the whole Christian world by the imposition of counterfeit Scriptures upon it. I shall yet persist in my reflexion upon the Jews, that I may shew that the keeping of Scriptures without forgery, falsification, and corruption, is a thing distinct and separable from erring & teaching errors. The Jews cannot be denied to have been good keepers of the Books, even then when they corrupted the Religion enjoyned by the Law written in those Books. Never yet was any man so weak, as to conclude that the Priests and Rabbies of the Jews were Infallible Judges of the Doctrine concerning the Messias, even those who condemned Christ the Son of God to be guilty of blasphemy and worthy of death, because they kept the Books of *Moses* and the Prophets. There is now less reason why we should take the present Church of *Rome*, which we evidently see to teach Doctrines and set up a worship as contrary to the Scriptures as darkness is to light, to be an infallible

fallible Judge of faith upon this account, becauſe the Primitive Roman Church in communion with other Churches did hand down to poſterity the holy Scriptures, without any falſification, ſince the Church of *Rome* at this day doth both accept and impoſe upon her own Children, and would but cannot upon others, Apocryphal Books for Canonical.

I have now ſhewed that theſe Queries are not unanſwerable by Proteſtants adhering to their own principles, or Axioms. I deſire you to conſider the reſult of the whole deſign: Except you allow him at firſt that the Roman Church is in propriety of ſpeech the Catholick Church, this diſquiſition can advance you not an hairs-breadth to a better opinion of the Roman Church for a Guide, then you had before. For after all the clamour made for reſolution of theſe Queries concerning the Catholick Church, the main Queſtion ſtands as it did, Whether the Church of *Rome* at this day be to be ſubjected unto, as an infallible Guide, and to be communicated with, all other Churches being abandoned, and particularly the Church of *England*, whereof you are now a ſetled member. Till this be reſolved, you that know the frame of our Church and the module of our Religion may ſtay ſafely where you are.

It remains now that I examine his Anſwer to my concluſive Querie. And I ſhall briefly note, what you may by your own reaſon or experience diſcover either abſurd, or falſe in it.

He doth not require you to deſert the Reformed Church of *England* for adhering to the Scriptures as the Rule of Faith: For the Roman Church doth that as well as the Proteſtant, as he ſays. If this Querift do not pretend to Infallibility and Authority over you, he will out of modeſty allow you to examine whether Papiſts do as well, that is as fully and firmly, adhere to the Scriptures as Engliſh Proteſtants. Certainly they do not well own them for a Rule, who accuſe them of obſcurity and imperfection, and make it a point of faith, that the defectiveneſs of Scriptures muſt be ſupplied with unwritten Traditions. And as certain it is, that we who maintain the fulneſs of Scriptures in delivery of all things neceſſary to ſalvation, and the perſpicuity in that delivery, and therefore admit

of

of no point of Religion that is a meer ſtranger unto the Scripture, do more cloſely ſtick to that Rule, then the Papiſts. But becauſe you are free to examine the adherence of Papiſts to the Scriptures in particulars by compariſon with the Engliſh Proteſtants, try whether a mangled Euchariſt, the real Sacrifice of Chriſt by a Prieſt that makes his Maker and eats his God, The publick ſervice of God in a forreign and unknown language to the generality of the people that muſt ſay *Amen* to all, Pictures of God uſed in Religious worſhip, the ſuperlative worſhip of the Virgin *Mary*, Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, the eaſe of departed ſouls by offering of Maſſes, the baptizing of Bels, the treaſury of ſuperabundant merits of Chriſt and holy perſons, *&c.* be as agreeable to the Scriptures as our Liturgy, and the 39 Articles agreed on in our Church. If you find it otherwiſe, and Papiſts do not ſo much as pretend to make Scripture the Rule of theſe Doctrines and practices, what credit can be given to ſuch an impudent boaſter?

But the ground of deſerting us he pretends to be this, That we will have the ſole Rule of faith to be the Scriptures in excluſion of Univerſal Tradition, and the voice of the Catholick Church.

1. Suppoſe the chief Paſtors and Doctors of *England* ſhould diſpute in the Schools about the Rule of faith, and exclude Tradition and the voice of the Church from that honour which they think due only to the Word of God in Scriptures, now ſince the deceaſe of the Apoſtles, and the unhappy diviſions of Chriſtians, that make it difficult, if not impoſſible to know aſſuredly, what is delivered by Univerſal Tradition, or taught by the Catholick Church; why muſt you upon that account, (or any man) deſert the Church of *England*, where the worſhip of God through Chriſt Jeſus is celebrated without any mixture of ſuperſtition, and the means of ſalvation are offered to you in a ſufficient meaſure for your conduct in the way of truth and peace? Let a Papiſt, if he can, prove that our making Scriptures the ſole Rule of faith makes the communion with our Church unſafe. Muſt you needs run out of our Church, as if it were a Houſe viſited with the Plague, meerly becauſe it relyes only upon the Scriptures for a Religion? And

if

if you must do so, must you needs then at the next step run into a Roman Assembly, that (as my Lord *Falkland* speaks) keeps her children from Scripture, as a Mother would keep her children from Rats-bane? Think of both these, because the Gentleman will not be pleased, if you desert us, but will not come to them. He will think himself still a loser, if any water go besides his Mill.

2. This calumny thus impudently fastned upon our Church shews this Querist to drive the Devils trade several wayes, in tempting by impostures, and in falsly accusing the brethren. For I challenge any Papist to quote (if he can and will cite an Author faithfully and fairly) any Article of Religion, or Writing of a Bishop, or sentence of an Academy, wherein we disclaim Universal Tradition, or the voice of the Catholick Church. For mine own part I do openly profess, that if any point in controversie between us and Papists can be proved to have been taught by the Primitive Church as a matter of faith, and derived by the voice of the Catholick Church from age to age, and this Universal Tradition be manifested by as good evidence, as is usually produced for the divine original of the Scriptures which we receive for Canonical, I will embrace that Doctrine as the Word of God.

3. *SIR*, you cannot but know, that we constantly reject many of the Popish opinions, obtruded upon the Christian world, as Novelties, which not only want a sufficient warrant from the Scriptures, but also cannot be made credible and acceptable by Universal Tradition. Such are the Popes Universal Bishoprick, or Oecumenical Headship, (which Pope *Gregorie* the great called the character of Antichrist) the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*, and many other points of Popish Religion, some whereof I recited above, and need not repeat. We have incessantly required the Advocates for the Papacy to prove the consent and conformity of the present Roman Church in these particulars with the Primitive Church, whose voice is the Precentor in the Quire, and the first circle in the diffusion of Universal Tradition. Thus, let due esteem and credit be given to Universal Tradition, but you see how little it is in earnest valued by Papists, or how

far

far they are from making use of that Rule, (which they extol so zealously as you hear) thereby to prove the truth of their religion. In fine, you may apprehend the No-reason to desert the Reformed Church of *England* therefore, because she makes the Holy Scripture the sole Rule of Religion, when indeed she knows no other given by God to the Church, and looks upon Universal Tradition whensoever it appears fair and full with reverence, as being the sense of the Church.

He proceeds to abate the force of my dissuasive of you from entrance into the Roman Church, when the condition of your entrance is the renouncing of your senses, reason, and charity. For the two former, though the terms seem hard, yet his rigour abates nothing of them. You must be contented to lose the use of your senses and reason, when you become a vassal to *Rome*. To mitigate the severity, he tells you, this is no more than Scripture and the Protestant Church requires. He abuses Scripture in two instances.

1. He says, was not *Lot* to deny his senses, when he perceived them to be Angels, *&c.* I say no, and the Scripture doth not say any such thing as this man supposes. When God thought fit, either to appear himself to the Patriarchs in humane shape clad with flesh in a transitory manner, (which is generally taken to have been a *Praludium* of the words, or the Son of God his incarnation) or to send Angels invested with humane bodies, the servants of God, to whom those heavenly messengers were sent so fitted for converse, were not bound to renounce their senses; but by their reason, and their knowledge of Gods way of entercourse with his choice servants by Angels, they were to regulate the notices of the object, which their senses represented unto them.

2. He cries out, How could our Saviour pass through a croud of People, and neither be seen, heard, or felt, without a deception of the senses? Judg, I pray, whether it suits with the Faith and Reverence we owe to Christ, the truth it self, in his Person, Doctrine, and Actions, to ascribe unto him the deception of the Peoples senses, which comes very near to the practise of *Magicians*, and will if admitted diminish the credit of Christs Miracles. Our Saviours passage through the multitude

multitude ſo, that he eſcaped their fury, and left them in amazement, might be wrought many wayes, which we are not concerned to imagine, and muſt not determine though we could deviſe, becauſe the Goſpel hath not recorded the manner of it. But it is raſhly and irreverently ſaid to be effected with a deception of the ſenſes. But how is Chriſts action at that time an obligation laid upon Chriſtians to the worlds end, to deny their ſenſes in the Euchariſt, where Chriſt inſtituted the material objects of our ſenſes to be the inſtruments of our faith, and the Bread and Wine are deſigned to be ſenſible Symbols of ſpiritual things even as the Water in Baptiſm is? Briefly, ſince our Bleſſed Saviour, the Angels and the holy Apoſtles, have made our ſenſes competent inſtruments to aſſiſt our faith and reaſon in judging of the truth and preſence of Chriſts Body, even after the Reſurrection, and Chriſt hath not any where by himſelf or his Apoſtles limited the free exerciſe of our ſenſes, nor leſſened the credit of their Verdict in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt more then in Baptiſm, is it not a horrid tyranny over Chriſtians, to require that we renounce both ſenſes and reaſon, and at the command of a Romiſh Prieſt believe that there is no Bread and Wine, where all our ſenſes (almoſt) conſpire to inform us of their preſence, and the very nature of the Sacrament requires it; and on the other ſide to believe that Chriſts Body is in every conſecrated Hoſt, and in every crum whole and entire, and continues one, though divided from it ſelf in a million of places, when our ſenſes can give us no information of this preſence, and our reaſon aſſures us that it is inconſiſtent with many Articles of our Creed? But obſerve the confidence of this Factor, who with a fore-head well rubbed tels you, that Proteſtants require you to renounce your ſenſes; whereas we think that our Saviours command, *He that hath ears to hear, let him hear*, holds by proportion in the reſt, He that hath eyes to ſee, let him ſee, with aſſurance, that the God of truth, who fitted man with ſenſes for the ſervice of his Maker as well as for his own benefit, doth ſecure him from deceit in the uſe of them about their proper objects, in Religion as well as in civil converſation.

Luk. 24. 39. Joh. 20. 27. Mat. 28. 26. Act. 10. 41. & 1. 9. 1 Joh. 1. 1, 3. Mat. 13. 9. Apoc. 2. 9.

As for our Reaſon, this he would perſwade you muſt be re-

 nounced

nounced in the belief of the Trinity, that you may renounce it for the eaſie ſwallowing the Camel of Tranſubſtantiation. Think what advantage this man gives to Heathens, Socinians, Anti-Trinitarians, and indeed all the adverſaries of the Goſpel, by confeſſing, that the prime Article of our faith concerning the God whom Chriſtians worſhip is more oppoſite to reaſon, then the ſcandalous Monſter of Tranſubſtantiation. The Doctrine of three Perſons in one God is indeed a ſublime myſtery, which is beyond the diſcovery of reaſon before it is revealed, and incomprehenſible by reaſon after revelation, as many ſecrets in the very courſe of nature cannot be accounted for by our dark and narrow underſtandings. Reaſon it ſelf tels us, that the infinite nature of God is not to be meaſured by the limited being of the creatures, and alſo that the glory of the inviſible God cannot be diſcovered but by his own manifeſtation of it, and that according to his own good pleaſure with different degrees of light, as Gods wiſdom thinks fit to impart unto man the knowledge of God: And laſtly, Reaſon reſolves that Gods Word, eſpecially of himſelf, who like the Sun is ſeen by his own light, is to be believed without diſpute. Since therefore God in his Word written hath clearly revealed that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt are one God, it is a kindly office of enlightned reaſon to bring down every vain thought and weak reaſonings that lift up themſelves againſt the knowledge of God, and to lead them captive under the obedience of faith. But there is no cauſe, why we ſhould ſtruggle with our reaſon, and unman our ſelves, that we may admit the diveliſh figment of Tranſubſtantiation, whereof there is not the leaſt ſhadow in the Word of God. This ſubtil Sophiſter aggravates the difficulty that may be fancied in the Trinity to the greateſt advantage of Atheiſtical cavillers, but he would leſſen the abſurdities of Tranſubſtantiation by an imperfect and falſe repreſentation of his own Doctrine, which hath no ground in Gods Word. All that is with any colour alleadged out of Scripture to give countenance to the lie, which we are required to believe, is the ſentence of Chriſt, *This Bread is my Body, This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood*, or My Blood of the New Teſtament.

Luk. 22. 19,20. Mat. 26. 26,28.

ment. Mark now, what a vaſt difference between the ſpeech of our Bleſſed Saviour, *The Bread is my Body*, (that is, ſignifies and repreſents my Body, as God himſelf ſays, *Ezek* 37. 11. *Theſe bones are the whole houſe of Iſrael*, and *Ezek* 25. 3. This, to wit the Hait before-mentioned, is *Jeruſalem*) and the definition of the Tridentine Fathers: The whole ſubſtance of the Bread is turned into the whole ſubſtance of Chriſts Body, and the whole ſubſtance of the Wine into the whole ſubſtance of Chriſts Blood. Where is this Converſion recorded in the Goſpel, or Apoſtolical Epiſtles, that we ſhould offer violence to our reaſon to work our minds to the belief of it? It is alſo falſe, that you are required only to believe that Bread is turned into Fleſh. We do believe, and that without renouncing our reaſon, that Chriſt who could turn ſtones into Bread, and did turn water into Wine, could turn, if he pleaſed, Bread into Fleſh, and Wine into Blood, as eaſily as he did Water into Blood in *Egypt*. And if Chriſt ſhould do this at any time, the change would be as evident to the ſenſes, as it was in all miraculous converſions, and the Fleſh would be as viſible, as the Serpent was into which *Aarons* Rod was turned, and the Blood as truly obvious to the eye, as the ſanguified ſtreams of *Egypt*. But Papiſts require your unreaſonable belief of another thing, to wit, that the Sacramental Bread is turned ſubſtantially into the very Body of Chriſt which was before that born of the Bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, and is now at the time of every converſion ſitting at the right hand of God in glory above the Heavens. By the way, (becauſe it is not my buſineſs now to refute this falſe Doctrine) remember that unqueſtionable Axiome of true Philoſophy; Nothing is before it is made, or whilſt it is in making. But Chriſts Body was before the Sacrament, and is already when the Prieſt begins the firſt ſyllable of his Magical murmur, by which he pretends to make the Body of Chriſt. You ſee the manifeſt contradiction, which you are obliged by Papiſts to believe in this inſenſible converſion. Now if you will, to pleaſe a Papiſt, renounce ſenſe and reaſon, that you may be capable of this rare belief, I know no cauſe why you ſhould not alſo take *Ovid*'s Poem of *Metamorphoſis* for a veritable Hiſtory. He fraudulently minces

Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 13. c. 4.

the matter again, when he ſpeaks of the eaſineſſe of believing that one Body is in more places at one time. I know that *Thomas Aquinas* in his *Quodlibets* ſays that the ſubſiſtence of one Body in more places at one time is impoſſible, becauſe that which is one in it ſelf cannot be divided from it ſelf without the deſtruction of its unity and being together.

But that is not all which you are bound to believe in this device: For you muſt believe, if you can, that the very Body of Chriſt which conſiſts of limbs and lineaments diſtinguiſhed by ſeveral proportions and ſituations, and at this time is now in a certain place in Heaven, clothed with glory brighter then the Sun, is now lurking, an inviſible and indiviſible Body, in all the Hoſts that are conſecrated, or inchanted rather, in the Papacy, and in every crum of every Wafer. This is the ſubſtance of the Popiſh Doctrine, which the Sophiſter rarifies into a thin cloud, but that hath ſtill groſs contradictions in it, which are enough to divert a man that would ſerve God with his reaſon and underſtanding from going into the region of darkneſſe, that is the Roman Church.

Rom. 12, 1
1 Cor. 14.

He would fain repair the breach which is made in their Charity. Here his jugling is unſufferable. He conceals the uncharitable condition of your admiſſion into the Roman ſociety. To joyn with Papiſts, you muſt break off communion with all Chriſtians that are not ſubject to the See of *Rome*. Can you leap over this ſtumbling ſtock, and think your ſelf in a ſafe Sanctuarie when you have ſhut up your ſelf in the Popes cloyſter from converſe with all Chriſtians beſides in offices of Religion? But all our complaint of their uncharitableneſs, he ſais, is our miſtake. You have read enough of that argument. I need ſay nothing now.

But ſee how untowardly this wolf puts on the Sheeps skin on his back. He thinks their Charity unreproveable, becauſe they (as he ſhameleſly affirms) cenſure not Perſons, but Doctrine, and that maintained pertinaciouſly. Read the Canons of the Council of *Trent*, wherein this is the conſtant form of curſing their Adverſaries, *Si quis dixerit*, If any perſon ſay ſo and ſo, let him be *Anathema*. And have not Armes been raiſed after that the *Anathemaes* were thundred, to extirpate with

with fire and ſword the doctrine of the Goſpel by deſtroying the perſons that profeſs it? What truth can you expect from ſuch open lyers, as the men of this mould are?

He ſays further that neither Papiſts nor Proteſtants can abſolutely Judge, who maintains an error obſtinately. Where then is their Charity, or Juſtice, when they do (as the Hiſtories of Chriſtendome ſufficiently witneſs) adjudg Proteſtants to be Hereticks, and ſo render them up to the ſecular arm to be ſlaughtered, as the Executioners of Papal decrees think fit?

But the Papiſts do ſo abound in Charity, that it is only out of Charity that they endeavour our converſion by warning us of dangers. I will believe that Romaniſts ſeek our Souls Salvation, more than Engliſh money, when out of meer Charity they ſeriouſly undertake the converſion of the Strumpets in the Popes Dominions, who are in as great danger of being damned, as thoſe whom they call Hereticks can be by their profeſſion. But they that are the Popes creatures dare not exerciſe their Charity to the impoveriſhment of the Popes Exchequer, to which the licenſed Stewes afford no ſmall contribution. Neither will theſe charitable ſavors of Souls allow us the ſame exerciſe of our Charity in *Spain* or *Italy*, although we are as firmly perſwaded of the danger, that Papiſts are in, as they are conceited of our perils, and have as much pity and kindneſs for poor Souls kept in bondage and blindneſs in ſpiritual Ægypt, as Papiſts have for us. Till we can obtain the ſame freedome for us to employ our Charity, it is not agreeable to juſtice that Papiſts ſhould be permitted ſuch liberties as they now take to make an oſtentation of their counterfeit Charitie, which is indeed carnal Policy to reſtore the Papal juriſdiction in *England*.

He proceeds in his falſhood, and denies the profeſſion of Faith expreſſed in the Pope *Pius* 4. his Bull dated *A.* D 1554. to be a new Creed. Do you not take that to be new, in Chriſtianity, which is but a little above a hundred years old? for the whole maſs which is ſuperadded to the antient Creed of the Church was never known for a Creed till that Pope gave it out for one. But what name will you find out for this Gentleman, who ſays it is no Creed; but a Catalogue of points

to

to be professed by teachers in publick Academies, &c.

If you read the Bull it self, you will see that *Credo*, I believe, runs through the vvhole body of the form, and I acknowledg, profess, assert, firmly embrace this and that, are the expressions used in that Creed, which is there also called, *The true Catholick Faith, without which no man can be saved.* The Queriſt also knows as well as I, though he doth worse than dissemble his own knowledg, that the Popes Bull enjoyns this Creed to be sworn to by all Eccleſiasticks (vvhich are more then Teachers in Universities) all dignitaries in Churches, all Regulars, &c. and it strictly charges all Clergy-men to endeavour as much as in them lies, that all men under their care and charge shall learn and hold this Faith. These animadversions I offer to your assistance in the giving a right judgment of the Gentlemans Reply to mine Answers.

If you please to offer a Copy of my Letter to the unknown person, you may do well. And if he shall return any thing that you shall think fit to impart unto me, I shall peradventure be at leisure to consider it, and tell you what sense I have of it as freely and plainly, as I have dealt in the examination of the precedent discourse. I conclude in St. *Pauls* words, *The Lord give you a good understanding in all things.* So I rest, *SIR*,

2 Tim. 2. 7.

Your very faithful Servant,

C. G.

THE emptiness of this spare Paper, tempts me to recite the Exposition of that acute Commentator Maldonate, who, though a Jesuite, expounds our blessed Saviours Precept, Mat. 23. 2, 3. far otherwise, than this Advocate for the Jewish Chairmen doth. His words are these; Ergo cum jubet servare & facere, quæ Scribæ & Pharisæi, dum in cathedrâ *Moſis* sedent, dicunt, non de ipsorum, sed de Legis & *Moysis* doctrinâ loquitur. Perinde est enim ac si dicat; Omnia quæ Lex & *Moyses* vobis dixerunt, Scribis & Pharisæis recitantibus, servate ac facite; secundum autem opera illorum nolite facere; ut *Hilarius* & *Hieronimus* videntur intellexisse. The sense of his words is this;

Therefore

Therefore when Christ bids them keep and do what the Scribes and Pharisees say, whiles they sit in the Chair of Moses, *he speaks not of their own doctrine, but of that of the Law and of* Moses. *For it is all one as if Christ say, All those things, which the Law and* Moses *have told you, when the Scribes and Pharisees recite them, do ye keep and perform; but do ye not according to their works, as* Hilarie *and* Hierome *seem to have understood the Text.*

Mark, that this learned Papist is constreyned by the force of truth, and uncontrollable evidence of the false doctrines of the Scribes and Pharisees, to imply tacitely that those Chairmen could teach a Doctrine far different from that of the Law and of Moses, *and openly to averr that the Doctrine of the Law and* Moses, *(that might then be well known) was to be the Object, and limit of the Observance and Obedience enjoyned, as due to the Ministery of the Scribes and Pharisees. The Commentator, to justify his Exposition, alleges* Hilarie *and* Hierome, *two ancient and very learned Latine Fathers, seemingly at least to have been of his sense in the understanding our Saviour's words.*

A Letter of Sir *Lucius Carie* Lord Viscount *Falkland*, to Mr. *F. M.* An. Dom. 1636.

Frank,

I Have received, not your Letter, but your Declamation: for I would rather believe, that you had a mind to exercise your stile, then that you are likely to make * Mr. Lee's prediction a Prophesie. But if it be possible, that having carried up Baronius, you should be in earnest; that you should be moved by the Authority of a Father living 400 years after Christ to the choice of that Religion, which I have shewed you in that question of the Chiliasts, oppose seven Fathers, (the youngest more antient than he, and the rest the most antient that are) That their Sanctity should move you, which not only their own learned Salmeron makes a false Note of the Church, but which, as I find by their own Authors, they have had but solitely, that their Piety is but the effect of their Emulation, who till we reformed their Doctrine, reformed not their lives, and owe the purity of their Church to him whom they stile the Author of ours; That you should choose them for the convenience of an Infallible Guide, when they neither know

* Mr. *Lee* once Tutor to that Gentleman did often say, that his Scholar would one day prove a Jesuit.

know her Infallibly to be Infallible, nor Infallibly what Definitions are hers, when those are yet more hard to be understood, than to be known, and those who have the convenience of so infallible a Director neither agree by what Notes she is to be known, nor what Doctrines she teaches, and cannot but confess, that there are infinite Questions which concern the Duty of our lives, of which she is wholly silent, and concerning which they are in the same miserable estate, in which we are who have none; That their Multitude should move you, who cannot but know, that almost all the world hath been Idolaters, and most Christians have been Arrians; *Indeed if any such Topical Arguments should seem to you worthy to enter the lists with those, at least much more apparent, Unreasonablenesses, which are in so many of their doctrines, as Transubstantiation, &c. If (I say) this be possible, I doubt not, but either at the end of this week, or the beginning of the next, to say so much more to you, as will serve to let you see, that those Works of theirs are very weak, which may be demolished by a Potgun. Till then I pray consider, That, if God (as we say) requires our Assent to nothing, but to what is apparent to be his Will, then there is no necessity of a Guide, since those who would deny apparent Doctrines, would as well resist an apparent Guide: And that they confess that it is Obstinacy, in which Heresie consists, and which damnation follows, and that sure this secret (I mean who is guilty of Obstinacy) is fitter to be reserved for Him to discover who made the heart, then to be judged by them who cannot know it, and both parts may keep their Opinions, till it shall be made there infallibly appear, both whose Opinions are erroneous, and whose errors are guilty; whereas the subsistence of the Commonwealth will not suffer Criminal matters to stay for so long (though a more certain) tryal. I am in haste, (for it is late, which time I was fain to take, lest your Mother should come in.)*

Your very affectionate

Brother and Servant,

FALKLAND.

Pray read *Baronius* over, and carefully. Not the Cardinal *Baronius*, whose Annals are compacted to serve the Popes Interest without any regard to truth; but a learned Divine of *Scotland*, who hath written solidly *De objecto formali fidei*, and hath defended his Discourse against *Turnbull* a Jesuit.

Baron.

FINIS.